

CREATION
AND REDEMPTION

SUPPLEMENTS TO NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL BOARD

President: W. C. VAN UNNIK. Bilthoven (Utr.) Netherlands

P. BRATSIOTIS

K. W. CLARK

H. CLAVIER

J. W. DOEVE

J. DORESSE

C. W. DUGMORE

DOM J. DUPONT O. S. B.

A. GEYSER

W. GROSSOUW

A. F. J. KLIJN

PH. H. MENOUD

BO REICKE

K. H. RENGSTORF

P. SCHUBERT

E. STAUFFER

VOLUME XXVI



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1971

CREATION AND REDEMPTION

A STUDY IN PAULINE THEOLOGY

BY

JOHN G. GIBBS



LEIDEN
E. J. BRILL

1971

Copyright 1971 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To
JEANNE,
wife and friend,
in love and honor*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface	IX
Abbreviations	XI
I. Problem and Procedure	I
II. The Relation between Creation and Redemption According to Modern Studies of Pauline Theology	6
I. The Historical Method	7
II. The Thematic Method	13
III. Choice of a Center	19
IV. Justification by Faith as Central	26
V. Some Methodological Questions	31
III. Creation and Redemption According to Paul's Theology	33
I. Romans 8 : 19-23, 38-39	34
II. Romans 5 : 12-21	48
IV. Creation and Redemption According to Paul's Use of Tradition	59
I. I Corinthians 8 : 6	59
II. Philippians 2 : 6-11	73
V. Creation and Redemption According to Post(?) -Pauline Use of Tradition	93
I. Colossians 1 : 15-20	94
II. Ephesians 1 : 3-14	114
III. Survey of Evidence	134
VI. The Lord of Creation and Redemption According to Pauline Theology	139
I. The Presupposition of Creation by Redemption . .	139
II. Redemption's Inclusion of the Creation	142
III. The Reality of Evil Under Jesus' Lordship	145
IV. The Lordship of Jesus as Mediator of Creation and Redemption	148
V. The Relevance of this Motif for Modern Man . . .	154
Bibliography	161
Indexes	184

PREFACE

The reality toward which this book points has been foundational for my life and thought during most of the past decade. After the Princeton doctoral dissertation of 1966 was accepted by the publisher, it was reworked in early 1970, and publications since 1965 were consulted. The basic thesis of the dissertation was retained, but the structure was altered to emphasize distinctions between material written by Paul, tradition used by Paul, and that used in possibly Deutero-Pauline epistles.

At the point of publication I remember with gratitude those who have encouraged this work and supported me across the years, prominent among them being: my hometown First Presbyterian Church of North Wilkesboro, North Carolina; Prof. L. B. Schenck of Davidson College; Dr. Donald G. Miller, then at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia; Dr. Bruce M. Metzger of Princeton Theological Seminary, who was my thesis advisor, and whose meticulous scholarship I again consulted during revision for publication; and the editors of E. J. Brill, especially Mr. T. A. Edridge. A fellowship from Union Theological Seminary in Virginia facilitated a year of study under Professors Karl Barth, Oscar Cullmann, and others at the University of Basel, 1955–56. Two grants as well as a research assistantship in New Testament provided moral as well as economic support at Princeton. In particular I am indebted not only to my family and friends, but also to Prof. Otto A. Piper, whose seventy-ninth birthday is today, in whose seminar on the Apostle Paul the thesis of this book was germinated, and whose sustaining counsel has providentially continued without ceasing.

Ian Christopher Gibbs was born just as his father was beginning the top of p. 106, concerning ἀρχή.

442 Cedar Lane
Moorhead, Minnesota

John G. Gibbs

November 29, 1970
Thanksgiving Weekend

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ATANT</i>	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag.
<i>B</i>	Biblica. Rome, 1920ff.
<i>BHT</i>	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.
<i>BJRL</i>	Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. Manchester, 1903ff.
<i>CBQ</i>	Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Washington, 1939ff.
<i>CGTC</i>	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary. London: Cambridge University Press.
<i>CNT</i>	Commentaire du Nouveau Testament. Neuchâtel-Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé.
<i>EQ</i>	Evangelical Quarterly. London, 1929ff.
<i>ET</i>	Expository Times. Edinburgh, 1889ff.
<i>EvT</i>	Evangelische Theologie. München, 1934ff.
<i>FRLANT</i>	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
<i>HNT</i>	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr-Paul Siebeck.
<i>HNTC</i>	Harper's New Testament Commentaries. New York: Harper & Brothers.
<i>HTKNT</i>	Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder.
<i>ICC</i>	International Critical Commentary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
<i>Interp</i>	Interpretation; a Journal of Bible and Theology. Richmond, Va., 1947ff.
<i>JBL</i>	Journal of Biblical Literature. New Haven; Boston; Philadelphia, 1881ff.
<i>JTC</i>	Journal for Theology and the Church. New York: Harper and Row.
<i>JTS</i>	Journal of Theological Studies. Oxford, new series 1950ff.
<i>K-EKNT</i>	Kritischer-Exegetischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
<i>MNTC</i>	The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
<i>NT</i>	Novum Testamentum. Leiden, 1956ff.
<i>NTSt</i>	New Testament Studies. Cambridge, 1954ff.
<i>NTTS</i>	New Testament Tools and Studies (ed. Bruce M. Metzger). Leiden: E. J. Brill; and Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
<i>RB</i>	Revue Biblique. Paris, 1892ff.
<i>RGG</i>	Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr.
<i>RHPR</i>	Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses. Strasbourg, 1921ff.
<i>RSPT</i>	Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques. Paris, 1907ff.
<i>SBT</i>	Studies in Biblical Theology. London: SCM Press.
<i>SJT</i>	Scottish Journal of Theology. Edinburgh, 1948ff.
<i>SNTMS</i>	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
<i>SUNT</i>	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

<i>TTod</i>	Theology Today. Princeton, 1944ff.
<i>TU</i>	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
<i>TWNT</i>	Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag. (E) = English tr.
<i>TZ</i>	Theologische Zeitschrift. Basel, 1945ff.
<i>ZNW</i>	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche. Giessen; Berlin, 1900ff.
<i>ZTK</i>	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. Freiburg i. Br., 1891ff.

CHAPTER ONE

PROBLEM AND PROCEDURE

The relation between creation and redemption has been problematical for some time in theology and biblical interpretation.¹ The mediatorship of Christ in redemption has claimed the center of attention with the result that no corresponding amount of labor has been expended on the problem of the relation between Christ and creation. A fundamental question, accordingly, for both systematics and biblical study is: what is the relation between the two mediatorial works of creation and redemption? Otherwise put, what at its inception was, and what possibly could now be, the meaning of cosmic Christology?

The following investigation attempts a modest contribution to understanding of cosmic Christology by studying the relation, according to Pauline thought, between creation and redemption.

¹ The problem was raised by Joseph Sittler, among others, at the WCC meeting 1961 in New Delhi. Cf. W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *Dokumentarbericht* (Stuttgart: 1962), pp. 512-523. The Faith and Order Commission has for some time been concerned with the relation between creation and redemption (cf. three papers read 1964 at the Aarhus meeting, pub. in *SJT* in issues of Dec. 1964, March 1965 and June 1965).

Otto Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work," *Interp.* III (1949), 286, observes that concentration on the person of Christ to the neglect of his work, especially in Western churches, has produced "a growing dissociation of the redemptive work of Christ from the work of creation." Gerhard Koch, "Jesus Christus—Schöpfer der Welt," *ZTK*, LVI (1959), 83, remarks that recent theology appears unable to deal with biblical texts concerning Christ's mediatorship of creation. W. Dantine, "Creation and Redemption: Attempt at a Theological Interpretation in the Light of the Contemporary Understanding of the World," *SJT*, XVIII (1965), 129-31, mentions three problems: the connection of redemption to "faith" and "the subjective world of man's experience," the prevalent identification of "the creation" with "nature" and "cosmos" with the double result that God is considered to be the "Prime Cause" and that the "*regnum potentiae Christi*" is rendered unintelligible, and the difficulties involved when lordship of Christ implies speaking of "God Himself." Dantine's method of beginning with "the key position of anthropology" has the unfortunate result, however, of dealing with creation "in terms of soteriology and eschatology" (133).

Welcome attention has been given the problem by James Perry Martin, "Cosmic Christ and Cosmic Redemption, An Essay in Interpretation," *Affirmation* (Richmond, Va.), I (July, 1967), 4-31.

Let it be underscored that the object of investigation is not two separate doctrines of Pauline thought, namely the doctrines of creation and redemption, but rather the single doctrine of the *relation* between creation and redemption. What is meant by either creation or redemption may be elucidated here only indirectly as the relation between them is investigated. It is not the purpose of this study to describe, on the one hand, Paul's full doctrine of creation and, on the other hand, his complete doctrine of redemption, in order then to deduce how Paul relates the one to the other. For example, the question in what sense Romans 4 : 17 may imply *creatio ex nihilo* is not immediately relevant to the purpose of discovering the *relation* between creation and redemption, though Romans 4 : 17 certainly does illumine the Pauline doctrine of creation. Nor is it the purpose of this study to provide a definition of "creation" or "redemption," or to contribute to present knowledge of the meaning of words concerning the cosmic totality and God's redemptive purpose. What concerns us here is neither creation alone nor redemption alone, but the nexus between them, the bearing of the one on the other, the *relationship* between creation and redemption according to the Apostle Paul.

The procedure will be: first, to survey studies of Pauline theology since F. C. Baur to determine how the Pauline concept of the Lord's cosmic work has been interpreted; second, to analyze six texts in the *corpus Paulinum* which explicitly confront the relation between creation and redemption; third, to present a synthetic statement of themes or motifs in the Pauline doctrine of the relation between creation and redemption.

First, the historical survey of representative modern studies of Pauline theology asks two questions of each scholar consulted —and only these two: (1) how does he approach Pauline theology as a whole, or what methodology does he use, and (2) what effect does that general approach have on his treatment in particular of the Pauline motif of the relation between creation and redemption? The survey is undertaken only to the extent that it contributes to the problem at hand by disclosing the exegetical context within which the present study is undertaken, for it is not our purpose to present a full summary of all problems and solutions which have been suggested in modern efforts to write Pauline theologies.

Second, the theme of the relation between creation and redemption is developed explicitly in six texts as it is not done elsewhere,

namely: Romans 5 : 12-21 (cf. I Cor. 15 : 21ff., 45ff.), Romans 8 : 18-39, I Cor. 8 : 6 (cf. Rom. 11 : 36, Eph. 4 : 5-6, Col. 1 : 16), Eph. 1 : 3-14, Phil. 2 : 6-11 (cf. Eph. 1 : 20-21), and Col. 1 : 15-20 (cf. Col. 2 : 8-10). Together these texts represent Pauline thought on this subject at different times—whether the thought of Paul himself or of some author(s) in “the Pauline school.” Further, they exhibit Pauline thought concerning this subject in a variety of situations: whether engaged in overt polemic against erroneous thought and behaviour (especially in I Cor. 8 : 6 and Col. 1 : 13-20); or developing in sustained manner, and with a minimum of polemic, basic implications of God’s redemptive purpose at work in the world through “Jesus Christ our Lord” (cf. Rom. 1 : 1-7; 5 : 12-21; 8 : 18-39;¹ and possibly Eph. 1 : 3-14); or relating his theology to the theology of the early Church (especially Phil. 2 : 5-11, Col. 1 : 15-20, but also the Adam-Christ analogy and I Cor. 8 : 6).

Concentration on these six texts means that this study makes no claim to be exhaustive. Other approaches which may lay claim to being exhaustive were found to be unwieldy or impractical, and for this reason have not been used.² Though one could

¹ The Church Fathers, Reformers, and others have often stressed that Romans is, as Melancthon put it, *doctrinae Christianae compendium*, but this is to neglect the extent to which Paul dealt polemically in Romans with antinomianism, and is to forget that certain important aspects of Paul’s theology are not fully developed in Romans, as W. G. Kümmel observes in his revision of Paul Feine and Johannes Behm, *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon 1966), pp. 220-22. Nevertheless, the truth seems to be on the side of the contention of Leonhard Goppelt, *Jesus, Paul and Judaism: An Introduction to New Testament Theology* (New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1964), p. 147: “Rom 1-8 therefore is not an apologetic confrontation between the Christian message and Judaism. It is rather Paul’s conclusive statement of his gospel...” In general agreement, cf. also: Robert M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 189-90; and Eduard Schweizer, *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 306-07, 317-20.

² The relation between creation and redemption is such an inclusive subject that an “exhaustive” approach is not as helpful as a carefully chosen one which penetrates to the most important aspect of the subject, namely the basis of that relation. It would be unwieldy and inadvisable method, for example, to attempt to deduce the Pauline view of the relation between creation and redemption from a study of words and concepts of sin and salvation, or of incarnation, or of any other *locus* of thought, though all these *loci* are interrelated. Contributions from other *loci* of Pauline thought to the doctrine of the relation between creation and redemption are likely to bring only secondary illumination to study of the thought itself.

To attempt to study exhaustively all possible texts which may seem to

formulate a conceptual framework or an outline within which to arrange the plethora of texts, words, and concepts which could be relevant to an hypothesis about the problem at hand, it seems preferable to begin where this study does, namely with six texts which speak directly to this problem.

It is best to begin with material that was undoubtedly written by Paul (Rom., I Cor., Phil.). There one sees both what Paul himself thought about the relation between creation and redemption and what use he made of earlier tradition about this theme. Next one might well inquire about further development of this earliest tradition under Paul's influence (Col., Eph.).

The term *corpus Paulinum* is thus intended to refer to that body of material which may reasonably be assigned either to Paul himself or to some author(s) who worked under the predominant influence of the apostle Paul, and the adjective "Pauline" refers to the same.¹

relate directly or indirectly to the relation between creation and redemption would also be to adopt an impractical method, both because of the well-known interrelatedness of all doctrines in Christian theology (whether "biblical" or "systematic") and because of the Pauline way of thinking, which has been well described by H. J. Schoeps, *Paul: The Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (Philadelphia: Hestminster, 1961), p. 49 (cf. p. 46): "Paul was a dynamic personality, on whom thoughts rained so that he was driven ceaselessly from the one to the other. Moreover, his thought was penetrating, leading us to well-nigh unfathomable depths. Often he merely suggests and instead of a whole chain of thought will give us flashes of ideas. Further, he does not always discipline linguistically these thoughts which tumble over each other."

Gal. 6 : 14-15, for instance, uses three terms (κόσμος, κύριος, καινή κτίσις) that appear *prima facie* to be related to the motif at hand. These terms occur, however, in a section whose main problem is circumcision. It is clear that this text, unlike the six texts which were chosen, does not relate Christ to the creation. Paul does not recommend crucifixion to the cosmic totality, but rather (as in Phil. 3 : 3-11) to the world of advantages derived from Israelite descent and Pharisaic rank. Concerning different meanings, according to contextual usage, of the term κόσμος, cf. Ernest Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1921) pp. 354, 514. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1952), I, 254-59, confines the meaning of κόσμος with too few exceptions, to "the world of men."

¹ Scholars have differed greatly concerning the authorship of separate letters in the *corpus Paulinum*. Cf. W. G. Kümmel, *op. cit.*, who provides a most helpful summary of viewpoints concerning provenance. The genuineness of Romans, I and II Corinthians, and Galatians seems incontestable, and this author would add to these four (whose Pauline authorship was affirmed by F. C. Baur) I and II Thessalonians and Philippians, for even modern partition-theories concerning Philippians do not question the Pauline author-

Third, after this analytical study, it becomes possible to suggest a unified account of Pauline thought concerning the relation between creation and redemption. Certain emphases in the Pauline epistles are repeated in various ways, so that some motifs begin to appear. The arrangement of these motifs will be inferred from the Pauline materials and as such cannot avoid the problem of possible distortion which is endemic to every attempt to write a biblical theology or to discuss in orderly fashion one facet of the theology of any given biblical author. But by beginning our study with the Pauline material itself, any distortion which might occur in the synthetic statement should be readily recognizable as such to the reader, and thus be made subject to later correction.

ship of that letter. The genuineness of Ephesians and Colossians has been more widely contested. The discussion concerning these epistles has been surveyed by Werner Schmauch, *Beiheft* to Ernst Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon* (K-EKNT, IX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964).

The conclusions of the present study do not depend on any detailed theory of the chronology of Paul's letters or any hypothesis about the development of Paul's thought. Such theories are far too inconclusive and too much dependent on vague impressions to be of substantive value for interpreting Paul. C. H. Dodd, "The Mind of Paul: II," *New Testament Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953), pp. 82-128, bases his hypothesis about development in the thought of Paul, for example, on three lines of dubious argumentation: a theory about the chronological order of the Pauline epistles; evidences in these epistles, "studied from a psychological point of view," of changes in the apostle's own character; and a theory that Paul's thought matured from early apocalyptic to later mysticism. Robert M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), p. 173, also expresses skepticism about chronological reconstruction of the life of Paul and hypotheses of Paul's psychological development. Cf. the balanced and cautious discussion of the chronology of Paul's life by W. G. Kümmel, *op. cit.*, pp. 177-79.

One may agree with J. C. Hurd, Jr., "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology," in Farmer, Moule, and Niebuhr (eds.), *Christian History and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967), pp. 225-48, about the importance of quest of the historical Paul for understanding his theology. "The goal is a connected sequence of events behind the letters and a sequence of the letters themselves" (247). It remains, however, to see that goal attained.

The recent study by Charles Buck, *Saint Paul: A Study of the Development of His Thought* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969) leaves and raises many unsolved problems. Cf. review of same by V. P. Furnish, *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXVIII (1970), 289-303. Cf. *infra*, pp. 134-135, n. 1, concerning Christological development.

CHAPTER TWO

THE RELATION BETWEEN CREATION AND REDEMPTION ACCORDING TO MODERN STUDIES OF PAULINE THEOLOGY

Because the work of F. C. Baur and the "Tübingen School" marks the major watershed in New Testament interpretation since the Reformation, the following survey of Pauline interpretation begins with Baur.¹ *Modern* means, then, "since Baur."

Four methods of studying Pauline theology have been observed and will be discussed in this chapter: the historical method, the thematic or *loci* method, that method which chooses a central motif (*centrum Paulinum*) by which to interpret all Paul's theology, and the particular form of this method that interprets Paul from the perspective of "justification by faith." An attempt will be made to determine the effects of each method on interpretation of the relation between creation and redemption.²

¹ Baur's earliest and perhaps most influential critical treatment is his work "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen und paulinischen Christenthums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, IV (1831), 61ff., cited in W. G. Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament (Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme)* (Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1958), pp. 156-58, 535.

The continuing influence of Baur on modern Pauline research was lucidly set forth by Johannes Munck at the 100th meeting of Society of Biblical Literature: "Pauline Research Since Schweitzer," in J. Philip Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship* (New York: Abingdon, 1965), pp. 166-77.

² It is not the purpose of this chapter to make an exhaustive survey of interpretations of Pauline theology and of the Pauline sections of interpretations of New Testament theology. Only studies of Pauline theology as a whole and such studies as are representative of major schools of interpretation are included. Nor is the attempt made to evaluate in an inclusive manner the various approaches to biblical theology, the concern in this chapter being only to evaluate how these approaches interpret the motif of creation and redemption in Paul's theology.

Several fruitful possibilities suggest themselves as procedures for writing this chapter. One might survey chronologically the field of modern studies of Pauline theology and note the developments, trends, arguments as they took place. This is the procedure of Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters* (New York: Macmillan, 1951). One might discuss one by one, on the other hand, the various "schools" of interpretation, which is the procedure

I. THE HISTORICAL METHOD

There are so many different views of history that one uses the term "historical method" only with some trepidation.¹ But there are attempts to understand Pauline theology which begin with consideration of the historical problems involved rather than with the confessional stance of the author who interprets Paul's thought.

The historical method, as the term is used here, differs from the *loci* method which presents Paul's theology under separate dogmatic categories, and from the method which chooses a central motif with which to organize all other motifs. Historical method emphasizes Paul's position in the primitive Church with reference to his predecessors and followers, and/or the development within Pauline thought, and/or relation between Paulinism and extra-Christian influences such as Judaism, Hellenism, the Mysteries, Gnosticism.

The way to a joining of history and theology was opened in different ways by the respective founders of the *heilgeschichtliche Schule*, the *Tübingen Schule*, and the discipline of biblical theology. Though he was uncritical in his use of the Bible, J. A. Bengel saw that theology is rooted in history and therefore that the interpretation of any given text must not be atomistic but synthetic, in the light of the whole process or *Heilsgeschichte* that leads to the goal fixed by God.² F. C. Baur agreed that the approach to biblical literature must be synthetic, albeit a synthesis derived from Hegelian philosophy of history, but he also insisted that since the Bible originated in history it must be subjected to critical treatment.³

followed in outline form by Rudolf Schnackenburg, *New Testament Theology Today* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1963).

The purpose of the approach to be followed here, however, is to find various methods of studying Pauline theology, to present enough description of an author's work to facilitate a determination of what method is being followed and to indicate the effect of this method on the author's treatment of the Pauline theme of the relation between creation and redemption.

¹ Cf., *inter alia*: James Barr, "Revelation Through History in the Old Testament and in Modern Theology," *Interp.*, XVII (April, 1963), 193-205; R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press Galaxy Book, 1957); Louis Gottschalk, *Understanding History* (New York: Knopf, 1958); Karl Löwith, *Meaning in History* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1960); R. R. Niebuhr, *Resurrection and Historical Reason* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957).

² J. A. Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti* (London: David Nutt, 1855).

³ F. C. Baur, *op. cit.* Further discussion of Baur's methodology *infra*, p. 26, footnotes 1 and 2.

J. P. Gabler was the first to distinguish between didactic dogmatic theology and a new biblical theology which would be truly historical in character.¹ The result of these three emphases was the liberation of exegesis from the necessity of finding prooftexts for systematic theology and the consequent facilitation of an historical method which would be in the service of biblical interpretation.

A) Notable among precursors of a sophisticated historical approach to Pauline material were Otto Pfeiderer (1839-1908), Bernhard Weiss (1827-1918), Willibald Beyschlag (1823-1900), and H. J. Holtzmann (1832-1910). While retaining a primarily thematic approach to Paul's theology, each of these contributed to an historical interpretation.

Pfeiderer, in opposition to scholastic study of Paul, outlined four stages in the development of Paulinism and the early Church, after having presented in the first part of his work a thematic treatment of Paul's thought which was dependent on Holsten's psychological interpretation of Paul's conversion.² Weiss distinguished three stages in the development of Paul's thought, but described each stage in terms of a doctrinal system.³ Beyschlag emphasized, against Baur, the bonds between Paul and the early Church and, without discussion of possible Greek or Hellenistic influences, maintained that Paul's theology was indebted to the Damascus Road conversion, inspiration of the Spirit, the historical tradition about Jesus, the Old Testament, and Jewish theology.⁴ Holtzmann con-

¹ J. P. Gabler, *Jo. Phil. Gableri Opuscula Academica II* (Ulm: 1831), 179ff., cited in Kümmel, *op. cit.*, p. 532, n. 132.

² O. Pfeiderer, *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1877), I, vi, iv. Albert Schweitzer, *Paul and his Interpreters* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1948), p. 67, describes Pfeiderer's position: "Pharisaic and Hellenistic trains of ideas form two streams 'which in Paulinism meet in one bed without really coalescing.'" Cf. pp. 66, 81-83. Carl Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus* (Rostock: Stiller'sche Hofbuchhandlung, 1868) contended that the Apostle Paul was anti-Jewish. Lüdemann, *Die Anthropologie des Apostels Paulus* (Kiel: Universitäts-Buchhandlung, 1872), postulated that Paul had two doctrines of anthropology and redemption, the one series of ideas being Jewish-juridical, the other Greek and ethico-physical.

³ B. Weiss, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), 2 vols.

⁴ W. Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1895), I, 17, 21; II, 10-24. Ritschl's *Dogmengeschichte*, with a theology of "moral values" and insistence that there was no antithesis between Paul and other apostles, had already contested Baur's dialectic. Johannes Weiss, *Das*

centrated, on the other hand, on religious comparisons and sources outside the New Testament, and insisted on differences between Jesus and Paul ("the creator of Christology"), but described Pauline theology in terms of Baur's thematic scheme (which begins with man and leads through law, sin, and corruption to conversion, Christology, and redemption).¹

One will search these works in vain, with the exception of B. Weiss, for any indication that the relation between creation and redemption was of importance in Pauline thought. Pfeiderer wonders where the flesh-spirit antithesis originated, and thinks Col. has more affinities with Philo than Paul;² Weiss finds no mention of cosmic Christology until the late prison epistles, but these do not present Paul's major emphasis;³ only in a chapter on "God and the World" does Beyschlag mention the relation between Christ and the world;⁴ Holtzmann uses Baur's criterion of "justification by faith" to determine what is genuinely Pauline and relegates the rest to "Alexandrine" influence.

B) The use of an historical perspective in study of New Testament theology reached its high point through *religionsgeschichtliche* research. Prominent in this at its beginning were Paul Wernle (1872-1939), Wilhelm Wrede (1859-1906), and Heinrich Weinle (1874-1936).

If Holtzmann's work marks the summit of Baurian emphasis, it may be said that Wernle, Prof. of Church History at Basel, was one of the first to attempt to interpret the rise of Christianity extensively from the *religionsgeschichtliche* point of view. Against the background of popular belief in the ancient world and Judaism, Wernle describes four stages in the rise of the new Christian religion: Jesus the originator, earliest community tradition, Paul's Gentile mission, and apocalyptic drowning of Christianity "in a sea of Jewish fancies and feelings."⁵ The "three great facts" of Paul's system were: a

Urchristentum (1917 posthumous), carried yet further the challenge to Baur.

¹ H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), II, 73, 229-36. According to Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 102ff., Holtzmann stands in the post-Baur line. Cf. also R. Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 19, 30.

² Pfeiderer, *op. cit.*, II, 85-119.

³ B. Weiss, *op. cit.*, II, 97-124.

⁴ Beyschlag, *op. cit.*, II, 88-132.

⁵ Paul Wernle, *The Beginnings of Christianity* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903), I, v-vi, 120, 360, 387-88.

theology of redemption which included anti-Jewish apologetic and a "gnosis" for mature Christians.¹ Paul's theology is based not on objective realities of redemption but on a combination of subjective vision and missionary apologetic.²

The implications of Wernle's position for the theme of creation and redemption are clear: redemption is a psychological matter unrelated to creation, and all cosmological references in the New Testament were brought into the gospel as alien intrusions from mythological sources. The new Christology which Paul created "drew its inspiration, not from history, but from something above it—from a mythical being..."³ with the result that redemption is removed not only from creation but also from history, excepting the "history" of the individual believer.

Wrede drove a deeper wedge between Paul and Jesus than any previous treatment, making of Paul both an epileptic and the "second founder of Christianity." Jesus knows "nothing whatever" of that "which is to Paul all and everything." Paul's vision of Christ is unrelated in any way to the historical Jesus, so that his religious knowledge is based on introspection.⁴

Wrede's position, no less than Wernle's, is disastrous for any cosmic Christology. The powers of evil are "mere abstract terms" or "crude conceptions," the objective change of redemption is confined to humanity, and there is no relation between creation and redemption, just as there was no relation between Jesus and Paul—except that the earthly life of Jesus can be symbolic of the Christ of faith.⁵

Probably the most determined effort to approach New Testament theology from the *religionsgeschichtliche* point of view was made by Heinrich Weinelt. He insisted that there are no religious and doctrinal "concepts" in the Bible and that the history of early Christianity

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 227. "It is because Jesus alone is the Redeemer, that the world has to be presented as irredeemably wicked, and every other road to salvation closed to men. ... It is evident that the apostle's apologetic is very far removed from the preaching of Jesus" (I, 236-37).

² *Ibid.*, p. 337. Cf. disparagement of cosmic Christology (331-35).

³ *Ibid.*, p. 250. Cf. 288, 242, 248, 252, 306, 309, 322-23, 333.

⁴ W. Wrede, *Paul* (London: Philip Green, 1907), p. 179. Cf. Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901), which develops the thesis of "*Gemeindetheologie*"—e.g., Mark was alleged to have invented the historical framework of his gospel and to have written into Jesus' messianism the Church's easter-faith. Cf. *Paul*, pp. 1-40, 76, 151, 163, 178; Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

⁵ Wrede, *Paul*, pp. 92, 112.

must be interpreted according to "the general laws of religious development."¹

Weinel agreed with Pfleiderer that two contrary lines merge in Paul's theology: a Jewish-Pharisaic line which centers in the dogmas of justification and reconciliation, and a Hellenistic line which conceives of Christianity as a religion of redemption against the background of the antithesis between flesh and spirit. The theology of Paul is a development toward subjectivism and psychology, and his gospel is no longer of a new world (as in Jesus' preaching) but of the individual's way to salvation.² "Paul's doctrine of faith is to be understood from a purely psychological and religious point of view."³ Paul contributes to the religion of redemption, at the same time, an ethical pessimism which recognizes that behind the weakness of man there are strange metaphysical powers of evil. The doctrine of justification is not, therefore, the whole of Paulinism, for inseparably connected with it is a dynamic metaphysical redemption.⁴

On the other hand, Weinell would leave to one side "all that was not Paul's theology, but merely a part of the contemporary conception of the universe." Whatever Paul says about creation and "the powers" is subordinate to his doctrine of justification, "which forms the core and centre of his theology even though not in that isolation in which it has become the 'material cause of Protestantism.'"⁵ If Wrede made of Paul a theologian, Weinell sees Paul as a man whose theology is secondary to his character. If Deissmann saw Paul externally in his environment, Weinell sees Paul internally in his uniqueness as one whose experience and theology centered in the

¹ Heinrich Weinell, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums)* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), p. 8. Cf. Schnackenburg, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

² Weinell, *op. cit.*, pp. 238-39. "Das Evangelium ist nicht mehr die Botschaft von einer neuen Welt...; die eine Frage: Was muss ich tun, dass ich selig werde? hat alles andere aufgezehrt. Die Frage nach dem wahren Weg zum Heil ist das Problem des Paulinismus..." (*ibid.*, p. 239). Cf. P. Feine, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1951), p. 147.

³ Weinell, *St. Paul, the Man and His Work* (London: Williams and Norgate, 1906), p. 293.

⁴ Weinell, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 258. Cf. pp. 239-48.

⁵ Weinell, *St. Paul*, p. 289.

Fatherhood of God. Accordingly, although Weinel admits that there is in Paul's theology a "metaphysical redemption" and seems to have a glimpse of the relation between creation and redemption, his emphasis is too subjective to allow for development of the motif of creation and redemption.

C) Other important scholars continued comparative-religions investigations,¹ but it remains to be seen in subsequent exegetical chapters what challenges have been mounted, even by using tools of comparative study, against these early results. It has been characteristic of many religious-historical comparisons, and not only in a beginning stage such as this survey has described, that the theme of creation and redemption has been relegated to the periphery of Pauline thought. Formal analogies between canonical cosmic texts and, on the other hand, cosmic speculations or cosmogonies of neither Christian nor Hebraic rootage have often been claimed as evidences of substantive alien influences which were added to the earlier essential proclamation of faith. Such cosmic texts, for example, which did not square with Paul's presumably singular concentration on justification by faith, and which then were conveniently alleged to be imported and late, were shunted aside. Whenever such circular argument prevailed, whereby dogmatic presupposition made uncritical use of apparent analogy, the presupposition remained unchecked and quest of the historical Paul was frustrated. It remained to ask whether the apparant analogy was substantive,

¹ Wilhelm Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*² (*FRLANT* 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921), maintained that Kyrios Christology originated on Hellenistic soil where the titles Christ and Son of Man receded, and held that not only the Luke-Acts source but also Paul were primarily Hellenistic. Cf. also K. L. Schmidt, "Der Apostel Paulus und die Antike Welt," in K. H. Rengstorf (ed.), *Wege der Forschung*, XXIV, *Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964), p. 222.

Carl Clemen, *Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken* (Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1904), 2 vols., speculated about influences on Paul's concept of the principalities, but his emphasis on the love of God and forgiveness of sins found little room for any theme of creation and redemption. Hans Windisch, *Paulus und Christus* (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1934), based Christology on the charismatic functions of Paul.

Edwin Hatch, *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church* (1890), contended that Greek thought diverted the Church from moral simplicity toward metaphysical dogma. Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion* (1924²) and *History of Dogma* in 3 vols. (1922⁶), argued that Paul was part of the prolegomena of Church dogma, thus had no part in formation of early Greek theology, and had no metaphysical interest.

then whether the one term in the analogy was a source of the other, and it remained to determine whether Paul's thought really was, as so widely supposed, primarily a *theologia crucis*.

II. THE THEMATIC METHOD

A common approach to biblical theology was borrowed from systematic theology and has been termed the thematic or *loci* method. Though this procedure may be combined with historical interest, as was the case with Pfeiderer, B. Weiss, Beyschlag, Olaf Moe, and others, there is no necessity for doing so. The *loci* method simply designates certain themes of importance in New Testament theology, usually without setting priorities among them.

The choice and arrangement of themes, however, is generally influenced by the scholar's confessional or philosophical predilections. One has in mind a plan when using a thematic approach so that the various doctrines or motifs will follow one another in some order.¹ The placement of themes in relation to one another indicates, accordingly, an author's presuppositions and basic interpretation of New Testament theology. Three formats of placement have been widely used: that which begins with the problem of authority and moves toward ethics, that which begins with the problem of sin and concludes with salvation, and that which develops toward salvation from the datum of God's activity.

A) What is the effect on the relation between creation and redemption of that approach to biblical theology which begins with the problem of the authority by which to live? Three scholars, whose list of *loci* begins with revelation or grace, interpret these themes in terms of man's need for guidance in ethical decisions.

According to F. C. Grant the major emphases are, in this order: revelation and scripture, doctrine of God, miracles, doctrine of man, doctrine of Christ, doctrine of salvation, doctrine of the Church, and New Testament ethics. The theme of creation and redemption receives scant attention in a discussion of "the Christology of Paul,"

¹ For example, Millar Burrows, *An Outline of Biblical Theology* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946) and F. C. Grant, *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* (New York: Abingdon, 1950), begin with revelation and the problem of authority and end with ethics. E. F. Scott, *The Varieties of New Testament Religion* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943), on the other hand, accuses Paul of insufficient practical, ethical applications.

which considers Phil. 2 : 5-11, Col. 1 : 13-20, and I Cor. 15 : 20-28 as having been written in "mythological" language which makes use of "analogy, of anthropomorphism, of parable and picture and dramatic representation."¹

As E. F. Scott sees it, Paul's cardinal principles are: grace (and man's faith in response to it), the Spirit (all Christian life is life in the Spirit), union with Christ, and liberty.² He interprets Paul from the standpoint of the death of Christ as the answer to man's problem, and protests that Paul has severed Christianity from the law. There is no treatment of the theme of creation and redemption.

Millar Burrows chooses the following themes as important: authority and revelation, God, Christ, the universe, man, the People of God, the divine requirement, sin, judgment and salvation, eschatology and the future life, the way of salvation, the Christian life, special offices and functions, public worship, Christian service, moral and social ideals. The fourth theme, "universe," is a discussion of mythological, pre-scientific worldviews in the Bible, with no movement to the important theological issue of the relation between creation and redemption.³

These three interpretations are instances of an approach that in itself might well include the theme of creation and redemption, but which does not do so because of the manner in which even the category "revelation" or the category "grace" is described more from a problem-centered perspective than from the position of man receiving God's self-manifestation, a manifestation that need not, however, be "tuned in" only to man's problems such as the need for authority by which to live. Had revelation been described more as that which calls man beyond his problem-solving, more attention likely would have been given to the relation between creation and redemption.

B) What is the effect on the theme of creation and redemption of that format which begins with man's sin and moves toward the

¹ F. C. Grant, *op. cit.*, p. 241.

² Scott, *op. cit.*, pp. 109-115.

³ Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958), has the same general format, the first two chapters dealing with "faith and hearing" and "knowledge and revelation," and the last chapters dealing with the ministry, the Church, and the sacraments. Here, too, there is no treatment of the theme of creation and redemption.

fulfillment of salvation? Liberals, Roman Catholics, and conservatives have used this plan.

Notable among liberals are O. Pfeiderer and Maurice Goguel. The *loci* of Paul's theology are described by Pfeiderer in this order: sin and the law, redemption by the death of Christ, the Person of Jesus Christ, justification by faith, living in the Spirit, the Christian community, and the completion of the work of salvation in Christ's second coming and the end of the world. There are only scattered references to the theme of creation and redemption. Paul himself did not develop the theme of creation and redemption, for his theology centered in justification by faith.¹

Goguel tries to treat separately the life and thought of Paul under the rubrics of "the facts" and "the ideas." In spite of the fact that Paul does not speak of the Kingdom of God, he essentially agrees with Jesus.² The following themes are delineated: sin, theology, person and work of Christ, soteriology, morality, the Church and sacraments, and Gnosis. Paul was the creator of Christology and soteriology, and the two main elements of his message were: appropriation by each individual of the salvation realized in Jesus Christ and full possession of life. Paul's thought concentrates, accordingly, on individual salvation without any treatment of the relation between creation and redemption, nor of eschatology.

Two Roman Catholic scholars who use the thematic method are A. Lemonnyer and Max Meinertz. Lemonnyer contends that the unity of New Testament theology is rooted in the teaching and historical works of Jesus.³ There are three groups of writings in the New Testament, their respective emphases being: the Synoptics (the Kingdom of God and its founder), Pauline epistles and Acts (the new economy of salvation), and Johannine writings (the personality of Jesus). Pauline theology comprises four themes, in this order: from the state of sin to the state of justice, incorporation into

¹ Pfeiderer, *op. cit.*, p. 144. Cf. pp. 136-37, pp. 274-76.

² Maurice Goguel, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jésus-Christ* (Paris: Libraire Fischbacher, 1904), p. 11: "Dans la théologie paulinienne, le Christ prend la place que le Royaume de Dieu occupait dans l'enseignement de Jésus. C'est que, par suite des conditions dans lesquelles le christianisme de Paul était né, le Christ crucifié et ressuscité devait occuper dans sa pensée une place centrale. La chose importante entre toutes pour lui, c'est d'être en Christ."

³ A. Lemonnyer, *The Theology of the New Testament* (London: Sands & Co, 1929), p. 17; cf. pp. 18, 73-137.

Christ, the new life, and Christian hope. No place is found for the motif of creation and redemption.

Meinertz begins his study of New Testament theology by concentrating, also, on the message of Jesus which centers in the Kingdom of God. Because his interest was in the historical development of New Testament theology, he wisely adds a section on the theology of the early Church which centers in the risen Redeemer.¹ Consideration of Paul's theology begins with a study of the person of Paul and the presuppositions of his theology, and continues under the following *loci*: man before redemption, the Redeemer in his divinity, redemption, justification and faith, the new life in Christ and in the Spirit, the Church, ethics, and eschatology. The concept of "new creation" is briefly considered and dispensed with as referring only to the "new man."² At no point is the theme of creation and redemption considered as an important part of Paul's theology.

Beyschlag, who represents a conservative approach, sees Paul's theology as being determined by his practical, moral aim.³ In common with the Roman Catholic and liberal scholars observed above, Beyschlag begins his treatment of Paul's theology by concentrating on the human predicament. The order of *loci* is: flesh and spirit (anthropology), Adam and Christ (starting-point of Christology), God and the world, the establishment of salvation (through the death of Christ), the way of salvation (subjective realization of salvation), life in the Spirit, the Christian Church, and the consummation of the Kingdom. The relation between creation and redemption is not clear in Beyschlag's interpretation, being alluded to only in the concluding six pages and in Chapter Four, which considers the relation between Christ and the world in the context of the Trinity.⁴ It appears that Beyschlag's presupposition that Paul's theology is only practical and moral in character excludes from the outset any serious consideration of the theme of creation and redemption.

C) A third thematic pattern begins not with man's problems but with God's activity in Jesus Christ. Bernhard Weiss, Adolf

¹ Max Meinertz, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950), I, 212-47.

² *Ibid.*, II, 108.

³ Beyschlag, *op. cit.*, II, 25.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 276-81; cf. II, 97-100.

Schlatter, and Olaf Moe, who use this format, have more to say about the theme of creation and redemption than do others.

Weiss begins his interpretation of Pauline theology with the theme of eschatology, much to the satisfaction of Albert Schweitzer, for the earliest phase of Paul's thought portrays the gospel as the way of deliverance from judgment.¹ In the next stage of Paul's thought, represented by the "four great epistles," the emphasis is alleged to be on justification by faith, as Weiss' choice of themes indicates: universal sinfulness, heathendom and Judaism, prophecy and fulfillment, Christology, redemption and justification, the new life (sacraments), predestination, the Church, and eschatology. The theme of creation and redemption does not figure, he thinks, until the final stage, that of "the more developed doctrines" of Christ's cosmic significance. At this point Weiss provides a more thorough discussion of the motif of creation and redemption than any yet observed in this survey.² It is striking that Weiss' procedure, which begins with eschatology rather than human problems, can accommodate the relation between creation and redemption as a prominent theme in the latest stage of Pauline thought.

Schlatter, who continuously contended for the unity of life and thought, begins his interpretation of Paul's theology by investigating Paul's life-situation: his apostolate, his epistemology, his conflicts with Jew and Greek, and the judgment on mankind which he himself had experienced.³ Then follow the *loci*: the gifts of Christ (justification, freedom from the law, reconciliation, sanctification, vocation, election), the presence of God in Christ (incarnation, humanity, divinity, the Holy Spirit, revelation), and the Church (faith, love, the community). In the conclusion Schlatter returns to Paul's life-situation by describing "the determinants of Paul's doctrine": the relation between Paul and Jesus, the unity between Paul's convictions and his conversion, the battle within Christianity, and steps in the building up of his doctrine. The divinity of Jesus is set forth in Colossians and Ephesians as one of the later steps in Paul's theological development and in answer to the Gnostics. Paul's criticism of the Gnostics does not depend, however, on the

¹ B. Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 292-315. Cf. Schweitzer, *op. cit.*, p. 54.

² *Ibid.*, II, 97, 105-12, 113, 118.

³ Adolf Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Zweiter Teil: Die Lehre der Apostel)*, II (Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1910), 199-256.

separate theories of his opponents, "for he makes the principal decision on the basis of that certainty which is given directly with faith in Christ."¹

By showing the work of God behind and through Paul's life and thought, and by stressing that Paul was responding to the presence of God in Christ, Schlatter was able to avoid the tendency toward anthropocentrism which often characterizes the procedure that begins with sin and moves toward salvation, and thus Schlatter could include the theme of creation and redemption.

Eighteen years after Schlatter's work, Olaf Moe attempted another interpretation of Pauline theology, arranging the *loci* as follows: God and the world, man, sin and death, God's plan of salvation, the person of Christ, Christ's work of salvation, justification by faith, the stage of grace, the Church, ethics, predestination, and eschatology. Although the emphasis is placed, therefore, on justification by faith, Moe begins with a study of the "concepts" of God and the world, and his subsequent research is influenced by this starting point. Paul's Christology, for instance, is theocentric as was the Christology of the early Church, and not anthropocentric.² There is a direct and important relation between creation and redemption.³

D) The effect of the thematic method on the theme of creation and redemption depends upon how this method is used and what presuppositions guide the choice and arrangement of doctrines. Procedures which begin with man's predicament or the problem of sin and interpret Christ's work as being applied to that problem are procedures which either neglect the motif of creation and redemption by default (Goguel, Beyschlag), or ascribe this theme to development after Paul (Pfleiderer), or interpret the "new creation" as referring only to the "new man" (Meinertz).

On the other hand, though the theme of justification by faith is still greatly emphasized in their work, Bernhard Weiss, Schlatter, and Moe begin with the datum of God's activity (expressed as eschatology, God's work in Paul's life and thought, the relation between God and the world, respectively) and include the theme of creation and redemption.

¹ *Ibid.*, II, 389.

² Olaf Moe, *The Apostle Paul, His Message and Doctrine* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1954), p. 233.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 99-101.

That is, the closer one's frame of reference for interpreting New Testament theology is related to the sovereign activity of God in Christ, or to the concept of Christ's lordship, the more probable it is that the theme of creation and redemption will be reported as an important element in Paul's theology. Though it is theoretically possible, because of inherent interrelatedness of doctrines in systematic theology, to begin with any doctrine and move from there to all other doctrines, nevertheless, in the discipline of biblical theology, which is under no obligation to show a "system" in biblical literature, it is clear that too great emphasis on problems of sin and individual salvation may lead to eclipse or denial of other prominent motifs such as that of the relation between creation and redemption.

III. CHOICE OF A CENTER

According to some scholars, it is possible to find one motif in Paul's theology which predominates and provides the center from which Paul developed the other themes of the gospel. Salvation, redemption, *Heilsgeschichte*, eschatology, and Christology are Pauline motifs which have been chosen as such interpretative centers. Whatever center is chosen, the choice implies an effort to present Paul's theology systematically as an ordered unity.

A) Among those who interpret Paul's theology from the standpoint of the doctrine of salvation are A. M. Hunter, François Amiot, and C. A. A. Scott.¹ According to Scott, what is called Paul's "theology" grows out of the attempt to answer the question, "What must have happened in order to account for the fact that I and others are secure of, nay, find ourselves in enjoyment of salvation?"² To this question the answer is given that salvation is a fact of the past, present, and future: as past redemption, justification, and reconciliation; as present appropriation through faith and a progressive experience of life; and as future completion in the resurrected and spiritual body. Christology is rooted in this three-fold experience of salvation. Except for a few short exegetical notes expounding

¹ François Amiot, *The Key Concepts of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962); A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954); C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity according to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1927).

² C. A. A. Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 24.

some of the Christological titles, there is no treatment of the theme of creation and redemption.

A. M. Hunter, in the first part of his study of Paul's gospel, agrees with Scott that Paul's theology centers in salvation as past event, present experience, and future hope. The second part of Hunter's study consists of an apologetic for the relevance of Paul's theology "for today" and uses the following *loci*: the human predicament (sin, the demonic, original sin); the way of deliverance (reconciliation, the Atonement); newness of life in fellowship with Christ, by the power of the Holy Spirit, and according to the ethics of the new life; and the hope of glory. Although Hunter mentions Christ's cosmic significance, he merely quotes from Paul and provides no discussion of the theological significance of the relation between creation and redemption.

In 1962 the Roman Catholic scholar François Amiot also interpreted Paul's theology from the centrality of salvation. Salvation through Christ is "the great reality" of the Christian life and includes both individual (through justification, faith, baptism, union with Christ) and collective (through the Holy Spirit and the Church) participation in salvation as well as the final attainment of salvation. The result is that Christology is interpreted from the standpoint of soteriology rather than vice versa, and thus the motif of creation and redemption is not given any prominence in Paul's theology.

B) The closely related concept of redemption is the interpretative center of Paul's theology according to Fernand Prat, S.J., whose study of Paul's theology is in two volumes, the first being an historical approach and the second a theological study.¹ The motif of creation and redemption emerges briefly in Prat's exposition of Romans 8 and Colossians. Though the center of Paul's theology is Christ (not a metaphysical notion of God, not justification by faith, not the psychological contrast between flesh and spirit), nevertheless the mediation of Christ consists in his work as Redeemer. Prat interprets Paul's theology, then, from the locus of redemption: preparation for redemption, the person of the Redeemer, the work of redemption, the channels of redemption, and the fruits of redemption. The approach is similar to that format of the *loci* method which begins with sin and moves toward the fulfillment of salvation, for Prat

¹ Fernand Prat, S.J., *The Theology of Saint Paul* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, n. d.), 2 vols.

begins with the Pauline description of "humanity without Christ" and ends with "the consummation of all things."

It is striking that so little is said in this lengthy study about creation and redemption. There even occurs the assertion about Paul: "He nowhere speaks of a physical renovation of nature. The new heavens and the new earth, however they may be understood, are not found in his eschatology."¹

C) It was J. C. K. von Hofmann who, more than any other, brought the approach of *Heilsgeschichte* to prominence. He concentrated on the purpose of God which lies behind both the words of the Bible and the saving events to which they point, and he interpreted the "holy history" revealed through scripture as "a history which moves toward the reader and carries him with it to God's ultimate goal."² Von Hofmann reacted against the Tübingen School's intellectualistic interpretation of Paul, preferring rather to begin with Paul's whole life and work—a procedure followed later by not only Schlatter, but also H. E. Weber and Paul Feine. Though von Hofmann broke new hermeneutical ground, he did not develop the implications of this approach for all themes of New Testament theology, including creation and redemption.

Ethelbert Stauffer continued the *heilsgeschichtlich* approach by adding a distinct emphasis on the apocalyptic background of the New Testament. The development of primitive Christian theology, of Christocentric theology of history in the New Testament, and of the primitive Church, comprise the three chronological periods of his material. The theme of *Heilsgeschichte* is developed through the following *loci*: creation and fall, law and promise, the coming of Christ, the Church and the world, the present and the future. The motif of creation and redemption is developed at many points. If the Greek speaks of a cosmos, the Bible speaks of a creation which points back to an absolute subject.³ If modern theology thinks of

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 238–39.

² Otto A. Piper, "Foreword," in J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Interpreting the Bible* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959), pp. vi–viii. Cf. J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Vol. XI of *Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments*. 13 vols.; Nördlingen: Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1886).

³ Ethelbert Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), p. 59. The apocalyptic element is exaggerated, to be sure, as in the contention that the "pre-Christian" Paul may best be understood in the light of a study of his contemporary, Rabbi Akiba ben Joseph, "the great apoca-

time as "a form of human sensibility," the New Testament "conceives time to be the form of divine activity."¹ If for the Greeks history is only one phenomenon within the cosmos, for primitive Christianity the cosmos is only one phenomenon within history.² There is no Christology without demonology, and even the civil powers are ordained as an emergency measure to fight against the demons of chaos.³

God does not restore the *status quo ante*, but neither does he change everything. God destroys his creation, but only to re-establish it in its perfected form. ...God's final purpose is the reconstruction of the material world.⁴

Redemption is placed thereby within the context of creation, and *Heilsgeschichte* within the context of universal history. Although the element of apocalyptic is overplayed, Stauffer succeeds in rescuing the interpretation of New Testament theology from the excessively individualistic emphasis of so many scholars observed thus far.

D) It is well known that Albert Schweitzer chooses to interpret Paul, as well as Jesus, from the standpoint of eschatology, thus presupposing "the complete agreement of the teaching of Paul with that of Jesus. The Hellenization of Christinity does not come in with Paul, but only after him."⁵ Redemption is "cosmologically conceived" by Paul so that by redemption

...a man is transferred from the perishable world to the imperishable, because the whole world is transferred from the one state to the other, and he with it. The redemption which the believer experiences is therefore not a mere transaction arranged between himself, God, and Christ, but a world-event in which he has a share. It is impossible to form a right conception of the view of redemption held by the Early Christians without taking into account the fact that it was thus cosmically conditioned.⁶

But this eschatological gnosis is already demythologized, as it were,

lyptist among the rabbis" (36). Stauffer emphasizes God's vertical action upon history to the neglect of the work of God within history, which latter work connects the events of his people in a redemptive order and elicits their voluntary response of active obedience.

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 75.

² *Ibid.*, p. 76.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 67. Cf. pp. 81-86.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 227.

⁵ Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1931), p. viii.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 54.

by Paul himself into an eschatological mysticism which is "the centre of Paul's thought," and which shows that redemption is already present to the believer. This eschatological mysticism is superior to the eschatological gnosis "in that it replaces the external interpretation of the death and resurrection of Jesus by an internal interpretation."¹ Because of the resurrection of Jesus "the immortal world is about to rise by successive volcanic upheavals out of the ocean of the temporal." But this mystical doctrine of the world is only symbolic and is "nothing other than the eschatological conception of redemption looked at from within."²

The Paul of Schweitzer subordinates creation to redemption. Paul's problem is how to be justified with God and the answer is the individual's mystical union-in-Christ through the Church. Though Schweitzer wishes to maintain the objective reality of redemption, and appeals to the Kingdom of God to do so, nevertheless it is a kingdom "transformed from the natural to the spiritual."³

E) Three Roman Catholic scholars and a conservative Protestant exegete represent the attempt to interpret Paul's theology from the standpoint of Christology. For E.-B. Allo, "Christ in us" is the center of Paul's theology and Christ's work consists of the redemption and sanctification of humanity.⁴ Accordingly, no place is found for study of the motif of creation and redemption, and Allo's work stands as reminder that a Christological approach to Paul's theology is in itself no guarantee that the motif of creation and redemption will be accorded a place in Paul's theology.

Msgr. Cerfaux distinguishes three successive levels in Paul's emphasis on Christ.⁵ At the earliest stage (I-II Thess., I Cor. 15) Paul proclaims Christ's parousia and resurrection which make plain that even the incarnation "is only a preparation for the redemption."⁶ In the second level of Paul's Christology (Major Epistles) the Christian message is defined over against Judaism and paganism as Paul shows that Christ's resurrection and death have power in the lives of Christians, with the result that: "A Christian is himself a gift

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 74.

² *Ibid.*, p. 112.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 384-85.

⁴ E.-B. Allo, *Paul, apôtre de Jesus-Christ* (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1946), p. 109; cf. pp. 182ff.

⁵ L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1959), pp. 2-4; cf. p. 529.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 191; cf. pp. 529-31.

from Christ."¹ The third level of Paul's thought (Prison Epistles) provides the most complete Christological synthesis, centering in the concept of the "mystery" of Christ.

To express the content of the mystery, we have to define Christ's connection with the world. Christ unifies the world of men (both Jews and pagans) and the world of the cosmic forces. He gathers everything into the unity of God.²

If the primordial unity came from Christ who created the old world, the restored or "recapitulated" unity comes from the risen Christ who is our Saviour.³ Christ's *pleroma* ("the sphere in which his spiritual power spreads") is extended to the whole of the cosmos, including the heavenly powers.⁴ Cerfaux, thus, comes closest to the theme of creation and redemption in discussing the third stage of Paul's Christology, but remains convinced that redemption concerns mankind only.⁵

According to Père Bonsirven, Paul's theology is built on the central fact of the mediation of Christ, a fact which Paul presented only concretely and did not think through systematically. This mediation is effected in two phases: in eschatology and in the present.⁶ After a preliminary study of Paul's conversion, Bonsirven begins his Christological approach to Paul's theology within a Trinitarian context: "the Father reveals the Son in whom the Trinity reveals Himself."⁷ Christ the Mediator brings a universal mediation, receives grace, is the One through whom God communicates his Grace—especially in the Church and finally in the consummation. Within this framework the theme of creation and redemption sounds forth briefly but clearly. The first principle of Christ's mediation is the incarnation which conditions the creation. All creation is oriented thereby toward Christ as toward "the perfection of his work."⁸ Paul thinks of a continuity between this world and

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 362; cf. pp. 531-32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 533.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 424.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 428.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 429.

⁶ Joseph Bonsirven, *L'Évangile de Paul* (Paris: Aubier, 1948), p. 84. The content of this book is also in Bonsirven, *Theologie du Nouveau Testament* (Paris: Aubier, 1951), pp. 215-392.

⁷ Bonsirven, *L'Évangile de Paul*, p. 49. Cf. pp. 49-83.

⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

the next.¹ Bonsirven speaks, on the other hand, of God as "the first cause," a concept not amenable to the biblical view of creation.²

The conservative Büchsel approaches New Testament theology by distinguishing between the proclamation and teaching of Jesus and the proclamation and teaching of the apostles. The section on the apostles is given over primarily to Paul, whose theology, in turn, centers in Jesus Christ.³ In discussing "the eternity of the Son of God," Büchsel recognizes that Paul's theology includes the theme of the relation between creation and redemption. Indeed, Paul's proclamation of Jesus as the eternal, pre-existent Lord who is Mediator of creation, is a distinctive Pauline addition to the early Church's proclamation. Nevertheless, Büchsel's interpretation emphasizes the work of Christ in the salvation of men in such a way as to neglect the theme of creation and redemption.

F) The relation between creation and redemption is effected by the choice of a center, it has been seen, in proportion to the proximity of that center to God's activity in Christ. If salvation refers only to the individual, if redemption is only for mankind, if eschatology is made into individual mysticism, if Christology becomes little more than soteriology, then Christ's mediation in creation can only appear as a strange aberration in Pauline literature.

It is notable that no attempt has been made, so far as this writer could discover, to interpret Paul's theology comprehensively from the interpretative center of the lordship of Christ. In view of scholarly research on the effect of the Damascus Road experience on Paul, or on Paul's indebtedness to the *homologia* and "earliest Christology" of the early Church, or on the prominence of the lordship concept in the Pauline letters, it appears remarkable that none of these scholars made Christ's lordship the *centrum Paulinum* of their descriptions of Pauline thought.⁴

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 330-32.

² *Ibid.*, p. 148. Cf. p. 88. For a criticism of causality as a concept opposed to the biblical concept of creation, cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, "Creation and Causality in the History of Christian Thought," *Pastoral Psychology*, X (1959-60), 11-20.

³ Friedrich Büchsel, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Geschichte des Wortes Gottes im Neuen Testament)* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1935), p. 89; cf. pp. 108-09, 145-46.

⁴ This research is to be consulted in the following three chapters and in Chapter VI, Section IV.

IV. JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH AS CENTRAL

A) The interpretation of Paul's theology from the standpoint of δικαιοσύνη ἐκ πίστεως (Rom. 5 : 1; cf. 1 : 17; 3 : 22, 26; 4 : 3ff., 24; etc.) has been a typical Protestant procedure since Martin Luther, but it was carried forward with particular acuteness by the Tübingen School.

F. C. Baur built his "historical" approach to Paul's theology on the presupposition that genuine Pauline theology consists only of justification by faith.¹ That is, according to the criterion of presence or absence of emphasis on justification by faith combined with opposition to all legalism, Baur determined which letters in the traditional *corpus Paulinum* were genuine (Rom., I and II Cor., Gal.). The extent to which this *Tendenzkritik* reduced Paul's theology to justification by faith is indicated by Baur's judgment that the doctrine of Christ's "higher nature," like that of angels and demons, was a minor dogmatic question which was not included in the main system of Paul's theology.² Paul's system can well be described, indeed, even before his Christology is mentioned. With such an anthropocentric approach, it is not surprising that Baur's interpretation of Paul's theology gives about as much attention to the motif of creation and redemption as one generally gives to Whistler's father.

If Baur tried to interpret Paul's theology in terms of a dialectical history which carried Paul along with it, Carl Holsten turned instead toward the inner Paul and attempted to interpret his theology from a psychological viewpoint. According to Holsten, the dynamic source of Paul's theology was his conversion experience. The vision of Christ experienced by Paul the Pharisee and Jewish Zealot was the beginning of the gospel of the anti-Jewish Apostle Paul, and

¹ F. C. Baur, *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, II (London: Williams and Norgate, 1873), 128f., etc. Bernhard Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 289, observes that by Baur's undue concentration on the doctrine of justification as antithetical to Judaism, "not only the nature of the leading Pauline ideas, especially that of πίστις, but even the significance of his doctrine of justification is altogether misconceived." Cf. W. D. Davies, "A New View of Paul—J. Munck: Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte," *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p. 182, footnote 13: "Secondary sources and polemics determined the interpretation of Paul" by the Tübingen School.

² Baur, *Paul*, II, 234, 253-58.

this vision and beginning were "the immanent deed of a human spirit."¹ Accordingly, Pauline Christianity always remained a form of Jewish Christianity. The categories which Paul used to draw the implications of the cross for a new world-view are the categories of the Jewish Old Testament.² The effect of Holsten's approach was to drive an even deeper wedge between Paul's theology and the lordship of Christ than Baur's thesis had done, with the result that singular concentration on Paul's psychological experience excluded the motif of creation and redemption.

As was previously indicated, H. J. Holtzmann's amply documented and detailed study follows the Baurian line. His exposition, which moves from anthropology to Christology and finally to eschatology, centers on justification by faith and relegates to "deutero-Paulinism" the Pastorals and the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians.³ Accordingly, the full development of the creation and redemption motif in Colossians and Ephesians is attributed to post-Pauline developments. I Cor. 4 : 9; 6 : 3; 8 : 6; and 15 : 24-28 provide the barest contact-point with those later independent speculations about the cosmic Christ.⁴

Wrede's pungent remark may serve to summarize the problem posed by the Tübingen School's excessive emphasis on justification by faith: "The truth is, the soul-strivings of Luther have stood as model for the portrait of Paul."⁵

B) The Tübingen influence was not alone, however, in this emphasis. Conservatives likewise thought it permissible to reduce Paul's theology to the doctrine of justification by faith. C. F. Schmid, for instance, who became Professor of Practical Theology at Tübingen in 1826, took a position of biblical supranaturalism and maintained that the fundamental principle of Pauline teaching is *δικαιοσύνη*, a concept which sets forth "salvation in Christ in its independence of the law."⁶ Christ's redeeming work is restricted to that of justification by faith, although Schmid recognizes that the effect of redemption includes restoration of harmony in the universe.

¹ Carl Holsten, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus* (Rostock: Stiller'sche Hofbuchhandlung, 1868), p. 114.

² *Ibid.*, p. 97.

³ Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, II, 262-319.

⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 285.

⁵ Wrede, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

⁶ C. F. Schmid, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1877), p. 422; cf. pp. 430, 461-64, 478-90, 507.

Paul Feine's interpretation of Paul's theology begins in a promising way with Christology and even with the divinity of Christ—a theme close to that of the lordship of Christ.¹ Subsequent motifs in Paul's theology, however, are not related to Christology and the discussion is soon dominated by justification and the meaning of Christ's death and resurrection. In common with others who approach Paul's theology on the basis of the centrality of justification by faith, Feine contributes nothing to interpretation of the motif of creation and redemption.

C) The unique approach of Rudolf Bultmann to New Testament theology combines historical-critical research and an existentialist hermeneutic of the New Testament in such a way that the four methodological "formats" for the interpretation of New Testament theology which have been surveyed in this chapter all converge in Bultmann's work.

As Bultmann sees it, the interpreting principle of Paul's theology is justification by faith, so that his theology may be seen as a doctrine of man in two parts: "man prior to the revelation of faith" and "man under faith." In Paul's theology, says Bultmann:

Every assertion about God is simultaneously an assertion about man and vice versa. For this reason and in this sense Paul's theology is, at the same time, anthropology.²

Correspondingly, Paul has no metaphysical interest in Christ:

Thus, every assertion about Christ is also an assertion about man and vice versa; and Paul's Christology is simultaneously Soteriology.³

Bultmann's discussion of Paul's theology begins characteristically with an ontology of man, then considers man's sinfulness, and concludes with man's salvation.

In addition to Bultmann's emphasis on man and justification there is his *religionsgeschichtliche* hypothesis of the influence of Gnosticism on early Christianity. Certain mythological accretions on Christology are apparent, according to Bultmann, in the kerygma of earliest Hellenistic Christianity: (1) emphasis on miracles, in-

¹ Paul Feine, *op. cit.*, pp. 164–79.

² Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1952), I, 191. That justification by faith is the *centrum Paulinum* is clear, for instance, in Bultmann's assertion that "the central topic for discussion" was for Paul: "What is the way to salvation?" Cf. II (1955), 75.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 191.

cluding the virgin birth, as indicative of Jesus' divine power (in the Synoptics); (2) the theory of Jesus Christ as the pre-existent Son of God become man (in Paul and John); (3) a combination of cosmological and soteriological roles of Christ, a combination which is rooted in such Logos and Wisdom speculations as are evident in Philo and in Hermetic and gnostic literature.¹ Though Paul and John move in quite different directions, the indebtedness of both to Gnosticism is evident to Bultmann in the fact that both use dualistic terminology, both develop a Christology "after the pattern of the Gnostic Redeemer-myth," both use a "common-Christian terminology," both demythologize gnostic cosmological dualism and interpret the eschatological occurrence as already taking place in the present.²

Several questions must be raised about the implications of this approach for the relation between creation and redemption. Is it true that according to Paul "knowledge of God as Creator contains primarily knowledge of man"?³ Correspondingly, does Paul's conception of the creation depend upon "what it means for man's existence"?⁴ Can the κόσμος as "the domain of demonic powers" be considered only a mythical concept and is it true that the "spirit powers" derive their power ultimately from men,⁵ or, on the other hand, does the objectivity of evil have dimensions larger than mankind and which extend into the cosmos? Is there necessary antithesis between cosmological and existential statements, and are the former mythical but the latter alone part of the essential gospel?⁶ May all assertions about creation be excluded from the kerygma on the ground that cosmological speculations were current in con-

¹ *Ibid.*, I, 130-32.

² *Ibid.*, II, 6-10.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 228.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 231; H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*, 12 (1965-66), describes Paul's theology as dialectical anthropology that is indebted to Jewish-Hellenistic theology.

⁵ Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 257-58.

⁶ David Cairns, *A Gospel Without Myth?* (London: SCM, 1960), p. 209, points out that the cosmological statements of the New Testament contain two elements: "First, there is the intention to affirm the lordship and reality of Christ; and, second, there is the expression of this lordship and reality in relation to the beings of the mythical cosmology of his day, ... One element in this cosmology is, therefore, utterly out of date, and the other has permanent value. The cosmological is thus not wholly convertible into the existential..." Cf. Reginald H. Fuller, *The New Testament in Current Study* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962), pp. 1-24, especially p. 22.

temporary Gnosticism (supposedly) and in the Mysteries, or, on the other hand, is this conclusion a means whereby existentialist pre-suppositions make the gospel conform to themselves?¹

Such questions, which this author has raised elsewhere,² are not, however, the end of the matter. It appears that Bultmann's theology does not have a merely anthropological starting-point,³ and that his term "self-understanding" is intended to refer, as Ebeling says, to "a comprehensive understanding of reality."⁴ According to James M. Robinson: "His equivalent term 'understanding of existence' even stands in etymological affinity to 'ecstasy,' being 'out of one-self.'"⁵ Bultmann has not been fighting for a return of Cartesian egocentric dilemma nor a flight into pietistic mysticism, according to Conzelmann:

Bultmann's account of the theology of Paul (man prior to the revelation of faith—man under faith) was developed in the light of an understanding of faith in which faith was completely determined by its object, and not by subjective experience. Once this is no longer clear (and it is no longer clear to students today), the construction can look like a pietistic scheme and give the impression that the theme is not so much faith as *man* outside faith and *man* under faith. Indeed, even the catchword 'anthropology' is understood in this sense today, not least among the theological descendants of Bultmann.⁶

¹ Hermann Diem, *Dogmatics* (Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959), p. 90, makes the latter accusation against Bultmann. W. Rordorf, "The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann and Second-Century Gnosis," *NTSt*, 13 (1967), 351–62, though carefully stating differences between Bultmann and the gnostics of the second century, maintains that "Bultmannian theology and gnosis *do* have something to do with each other."

² John G. Gibbs, "Rudolf Bultmann and his Successors," *SJT*, XVIII (1965), 396–410.

³ Rordorf, *op. cit.*, p. 354; Fred B. Craddock, *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon, 1968), p. 175.

⁴ Gerhard Ebeling, *Theologie und Verkündigung, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie I* (1962), 47, quoted by James M. Robinson, "World in Modern Theology and in New Testament Theology," in J. McDowell Richards (ed.), *Soli Deo Gloria* (Richmond, Va.: John Know, 1968), pp. 97, 150 n. 41.

⁵ Robinson, "World," p. 96. Cf. Robinson, "The New Hermeneutic at Work," *Interp*, XVIII (1964), 358–59.

⁶ H. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. xv. Cf. Rordorf, *op. cit.*, p. 357. Conzelmann, *Outline*, pp. 159–60, puts two good "questions for Bultmann." Käsemann, *New Testament Questions of Today* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969), pp. 13–16, 35–65, 173, 176, 191, 244, is concerned about subjectivism and anthropocentrism in Bultmann's theology.

Bultmann himself has protested:

In (modern) religiosity precisely that is given up which—at least according to the Christian faith—grounds genuine religion: the tie-in of man to the transcendent God as standing over against him (*Gegenüber*). Religiosity has been thought out from (the point of view of) the subjectivity of man.¹

Problems remain in the thought of these interpreters of Bultmann,² and the question may fairly be put why Bultmann's intention was not more clearly served in the minds of so many observers. If cosmic references are to be demythologized into existential meaning, it is not clear how in those references "the tie-in of man to the transcendent God" remains. In any case, Bultmann deserves to be re-read in light of his stated intention and objective.³

V. SOME METHODOLOGICAL QUESTIONS

This survey of Pauline theologies discloses that there has been little or no affirmation of cosmic Christology as a theme of importance in Paul's thought. Why? Certain methodological questions that have come to mind during this survey suggest possible reasons.

To what extent is absence of cosmic Christology due to a prior

¹ *ZTK*, LX (1963), 341; quoted by Robinson, "World," p. 97.

² Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," referring to I Thess. 4: 13ff. and I Cor. 15, maintains that Paul reduces eschatology to Christology/soteriology. Robinson, "World," maintains that "it is in terms of world that theology today is seeking to move beyond a game of solitaire" (89), but judges that Col. "moved clearly one step beyond Paul, replacing the apocalyptic with the Gnostic version of loss of world" (108) and Eph. "goes even further into the Gnostic world." "Paul is located somewhere in the middle of the trajectory from apocalypticism to Gnosticism" (107).

³ Robert Kysar, "Rudolf Bultmann's Interpretation of the Concept of Creation in John 1, 3-4," *CBQ*, XXXII (1970), 77-85, is impressed by Bultmann's insistence on *creatio ex nihilo* in Jn. 1: 3, and he thinks that Bultmann's "interpretation is seriously shaped by the radical significance he attaches to the continuity between creation and redemption" (83). "The link between creation and redemption is just at the point of man's utter dependence!" (82) But that is not what theology has previously meant by the term *creatio ex nihilo*. Further, for Paul the link between creation and redemption (and it is not apparent that the author of the fourth gospel disagreed) is an implicate not of man's dependence but of Christ's lordship. On the other hand, Bultmann has said: "It is a fact that there is a proclamation, authorized by God himself, of his prevenient grace and love. This fact finds its mythological expression in the talk about the pre-existence of Christ." (Cited by Craddock, *Pre-existence*, p. 175.)

determination that Paul's theology is only a *theologia crucis*? How much of this absence may be attributed to a combination of that judgment with later discovery of cosmogony in Gnosticism, the Mysteries, etc., a discovery which offers the convenient possibility of inferring *religionsgeschichtliche* influence on the cosmic texts? How much is due to reaction against ontology, as for instance when Cullmann sees no ontological implications of functional Christology? How much is due, on the other hand, to Western emphasis since Chalcedon on Jesus' nature, with the result that his work has been neglected in a way that has not happened in Eastern Orthodoxy, which still emphasizes cosmic Christology?

Has attempted existentialist translation of the gospel been responsible for lack of attention to cosmic Christology—i.e., for all the value of this approach, can it translate equally well all essential components of Pauline thought? How much difficulty with cosmic texts has been due to the presupposition that the realm of nature is now the domain of science, and that biblical studies and theology have no longer any claim on that realm?

When all such considerations have been taken into account, are there yet historical-literary evidences that cosmic Christology was not an essential part of Paul's thought and of the tradition which he transmitted, or is the opposite the case?

Chapter II has attempted, then, to discover what problems have been presented by cosmic texts to various methods of studying Pauline thought. We here take seriously the dictum that no exegete operates with a *tabula rasa* for a mind. Subsequent chapters of exegesis do not begin in a vacuum, but in the context of this preceding history of exegesis. One ought not approach the texts directly without being aware of the methods with which Pauline scholarship has previously worked and with what results for the cosmic texts those methods have been used.

This chapter has sought to bring to surface major presuppositions in study of Pauline cosmic texts in order that the following exegetical study will proceed with that degree of self-awareness that can be achieved at this point.

CHAPTER THREE

CREATION AND REDEMPTION ACCORDING TO PAUL'S THEOLOGY

(Romans 8 : 19-23, 38-39; 5 : 12-21)

Cosmic Christology is not confined to Pauline *Antilegomena*. It is present in the letter which unquestionably the apostle Paul wrote to Roman Christians. What is to be made of this cosmic theme depends on such methodological judgments as were observed in the preceding chapter.

The axiomatic character of Jesus' lordship for Paul has been well established.¹ That datum, along with the unity for Paul of theological investigation and living experience, forms the major clue for the following three chapters.

In contrast with most interpretations of Paul which were examined in the last chapter, the following chapters suggest that one of the important implications of Jesus' lordship, and which minis-

¹ Kyrios Christology is incontestably pre-Pauline, but it has been debated whether it originated in Hellenistic Gentile (Bousset, Bultmann), Hellenistic Jewish (Hahn, Fuller), or Palestinian Jewish traditions (Baudissin, Cerfaux, Cullmann, Förster, Hunter, Kramer for "Mare-Kyrios", Rawlinson). Cf. Fred B. Craddock, *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon, 1968); Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Phil.: Westminster, 1963), pp. 195-237; Cullmann, *The Early Church* (London: SCM, 1956), "The Tradition," pp. 55-87; R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 67-68, 119, 156-58, 182-86, 203-42; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (*FRLANT*, 83 Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); A. M. Hunter, *Paul and His Predecessors*², (London: SCM, 1961); Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (London: SCM, 1966), pp. 99-107; V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 42-68. H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Phil.: Westminster, 1965), warns against reading Phil. 2 : 6ff. back into the Synoptics.

Earlier discussion: W. Baudissin, *Kyrios als Gottesname im Judentum und seine Stelle in der Religionsgeschichte*, vols. I-IV (1926-29); W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos*², (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921); R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I (London: SCM, 1952), 51-52, 124; L. Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul* (New York: Herder & Herder, 1959); A. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (N.Y.: George H. Doran, 1927), pp. 338-78; W. Förster, *Herr Ist Jesus* (Güttersloh: 1924); Förster & Quell, *Lord* (London: A. & C. Black, 1958); A. E. J. Rawlinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of Christ* (N.Y.: Longmans, Green, 1926).

tered to the needs of Paul and his readers, was the relation of Christ's work to the creation. Paul's interest is both Christological and practical, accordingly, and has nothing to do with an independent speculative cosmology or *Weltanschauung*.¹

The suggestion will be developed in this chapter by inquiring what Paul meant in his letter to the Romans: first, by the unmistakably cosmic terminology (8 : 19-23, 38-39), and second, by the relation between man and Christ (5 : 12-21).

I. ROMANS 8 : 19-23, 38-39

The relation between creation and redemption, which appears prominently in Rom. 8 : 19-23, 38-39, is described by Paul as one of the implications of Christ's lordship which, because of its importance as a motif in its own right that is separable from the theme of justification by faith, is relevant to the Christian's pilgrimage with and in Christ from suffering to glory. As E. Schweizer has contended, chapter eight shows what is true of Romans as a whole, namely that "Paul is not mainly interested in the individual's salvation, but in the redemption of the cosmos including all creatures, in which God himself gains his ends."² The descriptions of God's redemptive purpose at work in creation are not mere reflections of the inner working of redemption in the "heirs," but are rather descriptions of a reality alongside the reality of the Christian's freedom, even in suffering, for glory.³ The two realities are

¹ Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (Harper & Row, 1969), pp. 14-20, 173-74, 192-98. Uwe Gerber, "Röm. VIII als exegetisches Problem der Dogmatik," *NT*, 8 (1966), 58-81, points out that Christological dynamic moulded Jewish-apocalyptic materials in Rom. 8 so that there is no metaphysical dualism, but rather Christians' solidarity with, and responsibility for, all men and for creation. It is thus not necessary to choose, with Daniel Callahan, "Cosmic Purpose and Self-Identity," *TTod*, 25 (1968), 169-84, between immanentistic and transcendental models of self-identity. Paul was concerned *both* about human community and the cosmic totality under Jesus' lordship, and thus his thought remains relevant to the present situation of ecological as well as sociological crisis.

² E. Schweizer, "The Church as the Missionary Body of Christ," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), p. 320. For Schweizer Rom. 1 : 8 shows that "the whole cosmos is the field of God's revelation and of man's obedience" (318).

³ As Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (N.Y.: Scribner's Sons, 1896), p. 212, comment: "The 'sons of God' are not selected for their own sakes alone, but their redemption means the redemption of a world of being besides themselves."

bound together by the one redemptive purpose at work in both, as evidenced by the "hope" which is characteristic of both creation and Christians (8 : 20, 24), and by creation's waiting "with eager longing for the revealing of the sons of God" (8 : 19).

There is, thus, a duality in Paul's thought: he begins with the Kyrios and thinks through the implications of Christ's lordship for men, for Christians, and for creation and, at the same time, he begins with the Christian experience of the Kyrios and thinks through the meaning of the new life which is founded on his lordship. For Paul *Christus in se* and *Christus pro nobis* are inextricably united. To think of the Lord is to think of the implications of his lordship, and to think of the implications of his lordship (for mankind, for Christians, for creation, for universal history) is to return to the dynamic Origin of these implications.

A) In Rom. 8 Paul builds carefully from one step to the next in ascending order from the depth of chapter seven to the height of the conclusion in chapter eight. If chapter seven was governed by the principle of the Law, so that the imperative preceded the indicative and the rule of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{x}$ led to death and sin, in chapter eight the Spirit is sovereign, so that the indicative precedes the imperative and the rule of $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ leads to life and obedience.

One of the most important features of Rom. 8 is the close relation which it posits between the Spirit and Christ the Lord. The result of the Christian's deliverance from the conflict between the law of sin and the law of the mind (7 : 23) is that there is "no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus" (8 : 1). The evidence that there is no condemnation is the fact that "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death" (8 : 2). The new life of the Christian cannot be threatened or terminated by any judgment because this new life = being "in Christ Jesus" (8 : 1) = the Son of God dwelling "in you" (8 : 9, 11) = Christ being "in you" (8 : 10). The contrast between the law of the Spirit of *life* and the law of sin and *death* is summed up in 8 : 11 and forms the indicative basis of the imperative in 8 : 12-17, which exhorts Christians to live as those who are debtors not to $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{x}$, but to the Spirit of God.¹ There are several reasons for the Christian's indebted-

¹ W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), pp. 152-53, distinguishes between the "physical" and "moral" connotations of $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\acute{x}$ and tabulates incidences of each connotation in the Pauline epistles.

ness to the Spirit: because through the Spirit comes life which knows no condemnation (8 : 1-2), because by the Spirit the deeds of the body are put to an end (8 : 13),¹ because being led by the Spirit is synonymous with being sons of God (8 : 14), and because the Spirit tells us that we are children of God and fellow heirs with Christ of God, this inheritance being dependent on our life with Christ in his death and resurrection (8 : 16-17).

If Christ is in you (8 : 10), this means that "the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead," and thereby made him "Lord" (1 : 4), "dwells in you" (8 : 11). Indebtedness to the Spirit, accordingly, implies indebtedness to the Lord.² The sovereignty of the Spirit among those "who have the first fruits of the Spirit" (8 : 23) points to "the revealing of the sons of God," for which all creation waits (8 : 19) and against which nothing in all creation can prevail (8 : 38-39), for if God is for us in Christ Jesus our Lord, who is against us (8 : 31, 39)? The rule of the Spirit, which is confined to the sphere of humanity, is unthinkable apart from the rule of the Lord in all creation.³

Rom. 8 : 18-39 comprises evidences that suffering with Christ results in glorification with him and thereby the text furnishes motivating reasons for the readers to live as debtors to the Holy

¹ It has been disputed whether the reading should be *τῆς σαρκὸς* or *τοῦ σώματος*, but in either case the meaning would be similar, as scholars of quite different background have agreed. Cf. James Denney, "St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans," *Expositor's Greek Testament*, II (London: Hodder and Stoughton, n.d.), 647; Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I (London: SCM, 1952), 197. "Here *soma* is to be understood as the self under the rule of *sarx*..." (200). Cf. Rom. 6 : 12; 7 : 7ff.; 13 : 13; Gal. 5 : 16f., 24.

² According to Hans Wilhelm Schmidt, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (*Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, VI; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), pp. 7-11, the concept of the Holy Spirit, which predominates in chapter eight, is the basic theme in Paul's theology in Romans. At the same time: "Die Geisterfahrung ist ein Ausdruck der Christusverbundenheit" (135).

W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 196, points to the close relation between the Spirit and Christ in Paul's thought. Cf. especially II Cor. 3 : 17-18; I Cor. 15 : 45, according to which Christ became, through the Resurrection, the life-giving Spirit.

³ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 188. Cf. I Cor. 12 : 3, "...no one can say 'Jesus is Lord' except by the Holy Spirit." It is possible, further, that the subject of *συνεργεῖ* in Rom. 8 : 28 is *τὸ πνεῦμα*, the original reading having been *ΤΟΙΝΑ* rather than *πάντα*, as M. Black argues in "The Interpretation of Romans VIII 28," in W. C. van Unnik, *et al.* (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), 166-72. This does not, however, appear probable.

Spirit.¹ The first evidence (γάρ, 8 : 19) is creation's present "waiting" with "eager longing"—an eschatological tension which itself is an indication that creation will be set free *from* bondage to decay and futility and *for* (εἰς) the freedom which is rooted in the glory of God's children.² That is, the objectivity or reality of the movement from suffering to glory in the heirs who are led by the Spirit is attested by the objectivity and reality of the movement from suffering to glory in all creation. The subjection of creation to futility was done "in hope," thus indicating the work of a redemptive purpose in the creation. Second, elucidating the same truth from the opposite direction, the meaning of creation's suffering ("groaning in travail together until now," 8 : 22) and "waiting" (8 : 19) is rooted in the waiting and hoping of Christians for an adoption which means—not immortality of the soul, but "the redemption of our bodies" (8 : 23). Third, the movement from suffering to glory can be seen in the act of prayer where the Christian's weakness and ignorance about how to pray is replaced by the Spirit's intercession "for us with sighs too deep for words," an intercession which is "according to God" (8 : 26-27). The fourth evidence is that all circumstances, both good and evil, are used by God for the good of those who love him and are called according to his purpose. The whole movement from God's foreknowledge and predestination

¹ This view is not to be confused with that of Bernhard Weiss, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Göttingen: 1886), p. 392, who contends that 8 : 1-11 presents the objective basis of justification and life in the Spirit whereas 8 : 18ff. presents its subjective realization. The position taken here is close to that of Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), p. 68, who says that 8 : 18-31 provides grounds of encouragement for the συμπάσχομεν ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν in 8 : 17. Godet, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1956 reprint of 1883 Funk & Wagnall's edition), p. 312, contends that verse 28 marks the transition from the state of misery and suffering (8 : 18-28) to the state of glory (8 : 28-39).

² The "waiting" of creation indicates that its worth is not its own possession but inheres in an eschatological relation. As Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 146, says: "Die Schöpfung hat die 'Herrlichkeit' nicht als ursprünglichen Besitz, sondern nur als eschatologisches, erst in Christus kommendes Erfüllungsziel (Kol. 1, 15ff.)." Cf. also H. Güemes, "La *eleutheria* en las Epístolas paulinas. Examen de textos. II. Epístola a los Romanos," *Estudios Bíblicos*, XX (1963), 219-42. Maurice Carrez, "La signification actuelle pour l'histoire du salut du visible et de l'invisible dans la pensée paulinienne," in Felix Christ, hsg., *Oikonomia* (Hamburg-Bergstedt: H. Reich Ev. Verlag, 1967), pp. 109-17, shows that man has not been thrown into an alien history of cosmos. "Car le salut comme histoire c'est plus grand et plus large que l'histoire du salut" (116).

through his calling and justification to his glorification of those whose destiny of conformity to the image of his Son is reached, is a movement which declares that the Christian's *via dolorosa* is also a *via beata* on the way to glory.

Finally, the evidence that suffering with Christ results in glorification with him is summarized—"What, then, shall we say to this?"—in the phrase $\delta \theta ε ο ς \upsilon π \epsilon ρ \eta \mu \omega ν$ (8 : 31).¹ God's giving up of his Son (in suffering—cf. Gen. 22 : 16) is evidence that he will "give us all things with him" (in leading us to glory). Since God justifies, it is impossible that the Christian's present suffering could end in condemnation rather than glory (8 : 33). The "with him" of 8 : 17 is underlined, in effect, by the emphasis in 8 : 34 that Jesus' death was followed by his being raised from the dead to sit at God's right hand, there (like the Holy Spirit in 8 : 27) to make intercession for Christians. Paul stands persuaded (8 : 38), on the basis of the fact that "God is for us," that Christians are more than conquerors, through Christ who loved us (8 : 37; cf. 8 : 35), over tribulation, distress, persecution, famine, nakedness, peril, or sword. Christians are thus victorious because the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord rules over death, life, angels, principalities, things present, things to come, powers, height, depth, or anything else in all creation.² The centrifugal forces which work to "separate" (8 : 35, 39) Christians from God—so that the relationships described in 8 : 1, 9, 10, 11 would be nullified—are counteracted and overcome by the God who

¹ Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 97, thinks that 8 : 31-39 is an inference from 8 : 29-30. It may be, but the context is wider, certainly as far back as 8 : 17 and possibly as far back as 3 : 21, for 8 : 31-39 serves as fitting summary to the positive development (in 3 : 21-8 : 39) of the theme that the gospel is the power of God to salvation (in answer to the negative development of this theme in 1 : 18-3 : 20).

² Angels, principalities and powers were "hostile supernatural beings feared in Paul's day and recognized, although not feared, by the Apostle himself. Cf. I Cor. 15 : 24, Col 2 : 10, Eph 1 : 21." So says Vincent Taylor, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Epworth Press, 1955), p. 58. Further (*ibid.*), "height and depth" are not merely spatial terms "but allusions to the home of elementary spirits (cf. Gal 4 : 3, 9; Col 2 : 8, 20) supposed to inhabit the stars, and to demons of the abyss (cf. Luke 8 : 31, Rev 9 : 1, etc.)."

According to Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², p. 111, the lordship of Jesus includes the overthrow of all other powers: "Nach I. Kor. 15, 25f. erfolgt diese schrittweise bis hin zur Parusie; aber Stellen wie Röm. 8, 38f.; I Kor. 8, 6; Gal. 4, 8 zeigen doch, dass diese Gewalten grundsätzlich schon überwunden sind."

is *for* us and loves us "in Christ Jesus our Lord," and who dwells *in* us as the Spirit of that Lord.

The new life in Christ Jesus (chapters five to eight), therefore, is a substantial life, the reality of which is not threatened but strengthened by the struggle to do God's will (7 : 13-25) and by the sufferings of life in this world (8 : 17-39) which involve putting to death the deeds of the *σάρξ* (8 : 13). This strengthening is certain because it does not depend on the efficacy of the Christian's struggling and suffering but on the efficacy of God's work in Christ our Lord who loved us (8 : 31, 37, 39). That is, the movement from suffering to hope is not illusory but fact, for "God's love has been poured into our hearts through the Holy Spirit which has been given to us" (5 : 3-5).

If Romans 8 : 18-39 thus provides evidence that suffering with Christ results in glorification with him, this text thereby provides indirect evidence that "the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set me free from the law of sin and death" (8 : 2) so that there is no condemnation for those who are in Christ Jesus (8 : 1) and who give thanks to God "through Jesus Christ our Lord" for his deliverance of them from "the law of sin" (7 : 24-25). Paul does not consider the suffering and glory of Christ in isolation from the suffering and glory of those who are heirs with him and *vice versa*.

Were it not for the lordship of Christ at work in and for the new life of the Christian, there would be no meaning in the individual's suffering, no hopeful "waiting" of creation, no effective prayer, no good end in everything for those who love God, no God "for us," no overcoming the vicissitudes of life—all of which make us debtors (in our own experience) to the Holy Spirit whose law of life works "in Christ Jesus" (8 : 2) who is "our Lord" (7 : 25, 8 : 39).

B) Having seen the main argument in the context of Rom. 8 : 19-23, 38-39, it is now in order to examine key concepts in these two texts, most important of which are: ἡ κτίσις, ἡ ματαιότης, ἡ ἐλπίς, and the terminology in 8 : 38-39.¹

1. Besides the use of ἡ κτίσις to refer to a single creature (as in Rom. 8 : 38, "any other creature"), several meanings of the term have been postulated: non-rational beings (both animate and inanimate) as the totality of creation apart from man, or mankind

¹ A. Viard, "Expectatio creaturae (Rom., VIII, 19-22)," *RB*, LIX (1952), 337-54, remarks quite rightly that in large part the difficulty of expounding this text is caused by the ambiguity of some of the most important terms.

only, or "the new creation" of Christians only, or inanimate nature only, etc.¹

The main question is whether the term refers here only to mankind or, rather, to the cosmic totality.² The meaning of the term depends on the context,³ and in this instance 8 : 19 indicates that all of creation is being designated and that no dualism between nature and existence is intended.⁴ Rom. 8 : 20 refers, moreover, quite clearly to Gen. 3 : 17, which has to do not with man but with the entire creation.⁵ There is also precedent in Jewish literature for the idea that "creation" includes the irrational creature and the inanimate.⁶

If "the creation" may be taken to mean the entire creation, then, Paul says two things about this creation: first, that there is a solidarity between man and creation so that creation is affected by man's action; and, second, that in its very creatureliness creation is a recipient of God's grace "in hope." First, creation, through its subjection to futility, bears the pain of the Fall and awaits in hope a more perfect consummation of God's purpose. According to Paul, as according to the prophets and many apocalyptic writers, one cannot rightly speak of creation without speaking of man, nor

¹ Cf. discussions of various views by: Franz-J. Leenhardt, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains (Commentaire du Nouveau Testament, VI)*; Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1957), p. 125; F. Godet, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-14; H. A. W. Meyer, *Romans*, pp. 71-73; Otto Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer*¹¹ (*K-EKNT*, vierte Abteilung; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957), p. 172, maintains that κτίσις is "belebter und beseelter 'Kosmos.'"

² Among those who think this term refers only to mankind, cf. Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946), p. 72, footnote 16; John Calvin, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), p. 306, footnote 1; Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*² (Phil.: H. B. Garner, 1883), p. 424; H. W. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, pp. 145-47; G. W. H. Lampe, "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," *SJT*, XVII (1964), 449-62.

³ Viard, *op. cit.*, p. 342.

⁴ Uwe Gerber, "Röm. VIII 18ff. als exegetisches Problem der Dogmatik," *NT*, VIII (1966) 64-68.

⁵ Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950), p. 103. Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, p. 45f. Adolf Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1952), pp. 269-70, seems to mean, however, that ἡ κτίσις includes non-Christians in distinction from "the sons of God."

⁶ Strack and Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, III (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), 245. Cf. H.-J. Kraus, "Schöpfung und Wollendung," *EvT*, XXIV (1964), 462-85.

rightly speak of man without speaking of the world in which he lives.¹ Redemption takes place not only within man but must also affect the world in which he lives. It may be maintained "not only that the glory of God would be diminished if in the Kingdom there were radical devaluation of the personal life of the creature, but also that eternal life requires the element of 'world.'"² The whole universe takes part in the *Heilsgeschichte* of the sons of God (Rom. 8 : 22; Col. 1 : 16).³

Second, the worth of creation does not depend upon the presence of man in the universe, but on God's grace. The world is not a neutral material, but something which God has made. For this reason Paul's view of the deliverance of the physical world is not a dispensable footnote to his major proclamation of the gospel.⁴ For Paul, as for the New Testament as a whole, the symbols of apocalyptic eschatology "are not merely rhetoric and decoration. They are real media of power and life. Metaphor and trope constitute essential vehicles of the Gospel itself. They not only dramatize it but they participate in it."⁵ This eschatological imagery, especially apparent in Rom. 8 : 38-39, suggests, accordingly, "a renewed or fulfilled creation, not an acosmic state."⁶ Further, Rom. 8 : 19ff. is but one of many instances of the universal character of praise, or of a kind of "cosmic liturgy."⁷

¹ Cf. *inter alia* : Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-12; Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*² (Tübingen: 1923), p. 85; Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 148. Schneider, *Neuschöpfung oder Wiederkehr?* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1961), p. 83 observes the apocalyptic perspective in Paul's conception of the relation between man and the world, but wrongly thinks that Paul has no interest in the world itself (87). Cf. *infra*, p. 45, n. 3.

² P. Althaus, *Die letzten Dinge* (1956), cited by A. N. Wilder, "Eschatological Imagery and Earthly Circumstance," *NTSt*, V (1958-59), 232.

³ H. Sasse, *TWNT*, III, 893. Cf. Job 38 ff.; Prov. 3 : 19f.; 8 : 22f.; 14 : 31; 20 : 12; Is. 11 : 6-9; 35 : 1-6; 45 : 5-7; 54 : 5; Ez. 34 : 25-27a; 38 : 19b-23; Hosea 2 : 18; IV Ezra 6 : 55; 7 : 11; I Enoch 1 : 6-7; 7 : 6; 41 : 8; 45 : 4b-5a; 54 : 7-10; 65; 83-90; 101; Sib. Oracles III; Ass. Moses 1 : 12; 10; Apoc. of Paul 3-6.

⁴ G. O. Griffith, "The Apocalyptic Note in Romans," *ET*, LVI (1945), 153-55.

⁵ A. N. Wilder, *op. cit.*, p. 236.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 232.

⁷ Reinhard Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (*SUNT*, V; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1967), p. 211. Cf. Rom. 11 : 36; 15 : 9-12; Phil. 2 : 10; Col. 1 : 20; Rev. 5 : 13; 19 : 5. "Die Erlösung der Menschen bedeutet nicht die Preisgabe der übrigen κτίσις, sondern ihre Vollendung, und so gibt es für das NT so etwas wie eine 'kos-

If redemption could affect creation only through man, creation would be subjected to futility and could do no other than share the suffering of man. But there is a movement from suffering to glory in creation which attests the reality of the movement from suffering to glory in the lives of Christians, and the reason for this is that the Lord who is at work in Christians through his Spirit is the Lord over death, life, angels, principalities, and anything else in the cosmic totality. It is only because of the liberty which that Lord gives to "the children of God" that they, unlike the usual human tendency, bring hope to the world at large which, in its bondage, does not know that liberty. To be sure, Paul stresses the extent of redeemed humanity's influence on the creation, but that extent is due to the cosmic lordship of the Lord of the redeemed, which lordship he graciously chooses to exercise through them for all mankind and all the creation.

2. In explication both of the solidarity between man and the creation and of the worth of creation, Paul says three important things in this text: that the creation is subjected to futility, that it is involved in an eschatological tension toward hope, and that it is in all its parts (including the "powers") increasingly bound under the lordship of Christ.

Ματαιότης, as a contrasting term to τέλος, means emptiness, futility, purposelessness, transitoriness, so that the clause in Rom. 8 : 20 may be translated: "The creation was subjected to frustration."¹ Ματαιότης is the word used so frequently in Ecclesiastes and translated in the Revised Standard Version as "vanity." The statement that "the creation was subjected to futility" refers probably not to gnostic mythology but, rather, to the disorder in the universe which became evident in man's rebellion against his Creator (Gen. 3 : 17),² so that it would be mistaken to say that the

mische Liturgie'. Wer Gott nicht lobt und ihm die Ehre gibt, stellt sich ausserhalb der Schöpfung und ihres Lobgesanges" (211, ref. to Rom. 8 : 19ff.).

¹ Psalm 38 : 6; Eph. 4 : 17; II Peter 2 : 18. Cf. Bauernfeind, "μάταιος," in *TWNT*, IV, 525-30, especially 529, whose findings are essentially in agreement with the later ones of Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 496; Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 207.

² Gerber, *NT*, VIII (1966), 68-71. Cf. Eph. 4 : 17; II Peter 2 : 18; Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), pp. ix, xviiiff., xxiii, 50, 63 n. 9, 115; Leenhardt, *op. cit.*, p. 125 n. 5; Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 174. A. Thiessen, "Romans," in Orchard, *et al.* (eds.), *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953), p. 1065, lists four interpretations.

occasion of all creation's dislocation and longing and vanity is "createdness itself."¹ This judgment is supported by the context, in which it is clear that subjection to ματαιότης is synonymous with δουλεία τῆς φθορᾶς (cf. I Cor. 15 : 42).² The two terms ματαιότης and φθορά explain why "the whole creation has been groaning in travail together until now" (8 : 22).

In I Cor. 8 : 6 Paul refers to the reality of the powers of evil which lies behind pagan worship of "gods many, lords many." So here, ματαιότης may well refer to the gods of the heathen or, more properly, to the powers of evil which prompt men to the worship of such gods or "rulers of the stars," since the adjective μάταιος is "a standing term in the Greek version of the O.T." for the rebel angels, or rulers of the stars and gods of the heathen.³ If this is a valid interpretation of the term, the subjection to futility concerns more than man's rebellion against God, though the cosmic disorder was brought to light especially in man's disordered response to God. Since the subjection to futility is to be understood in the light of Gen. 3 : 17, it should be observed that in the Genesis story evil comes to man from outside himself, uninvited and unexpected, in the symbolic form of a serpent. For Paul also, there are forces of evil at work in the cosmos which are not only the product of the exchange of sin between the individual and mankind as a whole.⁴ There are a number of antitheses in Rom. 5-8, such as righteousness-sin, grace-law, life-death, spirit-flesh, and this section of Romans concludes amid "indications of the idea of a cosmic lawsuit."⁵

The much-discussed question of who subjected the creation to

¹ Karl Barth, *Romans* (London: Oxford University Press, 1933), p. 308.

² Cf. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, p. 146. But Schmidt wrongly separates the Fall from its consequences on creation (147). R. P. A. Viard, "Épître aux Romains traduite et commentée," in Louis Pirot (ed.), *La Sainte Bible*, XI (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951), p. 101, says that "vanity" is "the consequence of a proud disorder, a corruption (φθορά, v. 21), which is introduced into the world as a result of sin. The material world is incapable of procuring that for which it was made. Nevertheless, it is not held responsible..."

³ W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: University Press, 1939), p. 107. Cf. I Kings 16 : 2, 13; Is. 2 : 20; 30 : 15; Jer. 8 : 19; Hos. 5 : 11.

⁴ Rom. 7 : 21-23; I Cor. 5 : 3; Eph. 2 : 2; 6 : 12; Col. 1 : 13; (I Thess. 2 : 18); etc. Cf. A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel* (London: SCM, 1954), p. 75.

⁵ Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ and Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament* (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 260; cf. pp. 115, 261. The motif of conflict, however, is exaggerated in this study.

futility is not of the greatest importance for understanding the relation between creation and redemption, nor is a conclusive answer to the problem clearly at hand. It does not seem likely, however, that man, Adam, or the Devil could have subjected creation "in hope," so it is probable that God is the One who subjected the creation.¹

3. With his realistic view of the cosmic extent of evil, Paul at the same time is certain that "the subjection to futility" does not exclude ἐλπὶς from creation.² Whether ὅτι (which would state the content of the hope) or διότι (which would state the reason of the hope) is read, the meaning is essentially the same, namely, that the hope which is justified for creation depends on the freedom which is rooted in the glory of the children of God.³ The following two verses are a variation on this theme, the ἄχρη τοῦ νῦν implying that the birth of the new creation has come with the giving to Christians of ἡ ἀπαρχή τοῦ πνεύματος which, in turn, is a promise or guarantee of the coming "redemption of our bodies."

The subjection of the creation "in hope" indicates, accordingly, both that there is continuity between the world that is in subjection to futility (the old world) and the world that is in subjection to hope (the new world), and that there is no ultimate dualism in the universe, or between the cosmos and its Creator. First, the cleavage between history and eschatology is never radical because the new creation represents the fulfillment of the old.⁴ Second, even if Paul understood the present world to be enslaved to celestial powers or

¹ Sanday and Headlam, *op. cit.*, p. 208. Cf. II Esdras 7 : 75; 13 : 26; Isaiah 55 : 2-13; 65 : 17; Rev. 21 : 1; Gerber, *NT*, 8 (1966), 69.

² James P. Martin, "Cosmic Christ and Cosmic Redemption," *Affirmation*, I (July '67), 4-31, argues persuasively for "christological models which assign priority to the Resurrection" (17). "The redemption brought by Christ is not a restoration but a new creation (Gal. 6 : 15; II Cor. 5 : 17). The restoration theory is forced to interpret the Resurrection as casually related to evil and sin. But resurrection and new creation are not the effects caused by a cosmic fall, but God's free gift of a new creation" (29). S. Lyonnet, S.J., "Redemptio 'cosmica' secundum Rom 8, 19-23," *Verbum Domini*, 44 (1966), 225-42, agrees that the creation is made new as it takes part in the resurrection of Christ.

³ Cf. Jean-Philippe Ramseyer, "Signification de la création," *Verbum Caro*, VI (1952), 104.

⁴ Wilder, *op. cit.*, pp. 244-45. Cf. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV, 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1958), 329-30, who shows that Christian existence is not an end in itself, but is the existence of a universal mission even to the non-human creatures.

lying under planetary spheres, which would mean indebtedness to astrology of some kind, there is no ultimate dualism in his thought. "Creation always remained under the control of the supreme God, and was therefore never without hope."¹ Paul's view differs from that of dualism at two points: the "powers" are subject to God, having been created in Christ, and second, the power of their proud autonomy, in which they acted against their origin, has been broken in the cross and resurrection.² The background of Paul's thought is, accordingly, the prominent theme in apocalyptic and Old Testament prophecy of solidarity between the creation and mankind.³ In its relation to unredeemed man creation is subjected to futility, but in its relation to Christians (sons of God) creation is given hope.

4. Since the effectiveness of God's redemptive purpose in creation depends on the universality of Christ's lordship, the keystone of the arch of creation and redemption is supplied by the last "certainty" of the chapter in verses 38-39 where Paul asserts that nothing can effectively work against "the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord."⁴ Paul's certainty concerning the lordship of Christ over the cosmic totality is a realistic one which takes into account the extent of the power which is arrayed against that lordship. Though Paul's enumerations in Rom. 8 : 38-39 suggest nothing systematic as in a cosmology, Paul thinks of the principalities and powers referred to in

¹ C. K. Barrett, *The Epistle to the Romans*, p. 166.

² G. H. C. Macgregor, "Principalities and Powers: the Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," *NTSt*, I (1954-55), 28. Heinrich Schlier, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament* (N.Y.: Herder & Herder, 1961) describes eloquently and in contemporary terms the hostility of the powers to God and to Christ. Leivestad, *op. cit.*, p. 95 rightly underlines the "positive function in creation" of the powers.

³ For example, the created order suffers under man's sin (Is. 24 : 5; 33 : 9; I Enoch 2-5 : 3; 7 : 5-6; Mark 13 : 19), and creation accuses man by appealing to God against this wrong-doing (I Enoch 7 : 6 and ch. 101; Apoc. of Paul 3-6).

Further, God created this world for his people (Ass. Moses 1 : 12; IV Ezra 6 : 55, 7 : 11), so that their subsequent misuse of it might well deserve that this same world be turned against them. Accordingly, the universe as a whole or, more usually, certain natural forces are used by God to inflict punishment on wrongdoers. Cf.: Is. 34 : 4, 9; Ez. 38 : 19b-23; Joel 3 : 15; Zech. 14 : 12-17; I Enoch 1 : 6-7; 41 : 8; 54 : 7-10, ch. 65, chs. 83-90; Sibylline Oracles, Book III; Ass. Moses 10; Rev. 8 : 5, 7-8, 10, 12; 9 : 3-6; 11 : 6, 13, 19; 16 : 3-4, 17-21, 18 : 8; Apoc. of Peter; Apoc. of Thomas.

Cf. C. F. D. Moule, *Man and Nature in the New Testament* (London: Athlone Press, 1964), not available at this writing.

⁴ There are three "certainties" in Rom. 8. Cf. verses 22, 28, 38.

8 : 38-39 as realities against which Christians must contend (Eph. 6 : 12) and which ultimately will be subjected to Christ (I Cor. 15 : 24). Comparison of I Cor. 15 : 24; Eph. 1 : 21, 3 : 10, 6 : 12; Col. 1 : 16, 2 : 10-15 discloses no systematic arrangement of the various terms which are used to designate the same phenomenon.¹

It is not Paul's view that the power of these "spirit powers" derives merely from men, as Bultmann contends,² nor will it do to maintain that the synonymous term στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου "originated in gnostic or hellenistic-syncretistic 'myth,' " and is therefore "a concept that must be 'demythologized' in order to be meaningful for today."³ Just as there is a difference between the law in the service of God and, on the other hand, the law as legalism which works against God's redemptive purpose (Rom. 7), so there is a difference between the "fundamental forces inherent in the world" (the law and the flesh) which are not evil in themselves but are only "weak and beggarly" (Gal. 4 : 9) as ineffectual for salvation and, on the other hand, the interaction of the law and the flesh apart from Christ, which changes this "structural" neutrality into a source of the evil and sinful "character" of the world.⁴ In I Cor. 2 : 8; Rom. 8 : 38f.; Gal. 4 : 3, 9, it is clear that Paul asserts the reality of the same powers to which reference is made in Col. 1 : 13, 16; 2 : 14-15.⁵ To assert that not even these real powers can separate Christians

¹ Franz J. Leenhardt, *The Epistle to the Romans* (London: Lutterworth, 1961), p. 239.

² Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I (London: SCM Press, 1952), 258 interprets the "spirit powers" as belonging to God's creation and thus as subject to him (so that there is no final dualism in Paul's theology), but he asserts that the power of these "spirit powers" derives from men.

³ A. J. Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements of the World*, p. 175. Macgregor, *op. cit.*, pp. 21f., identifies the *stoicheia* in Gal. 4 and Col. 2 with the "principalities and powers." Macgregor's contention that Paul's terms for the cosmic powers are indebted to "Gnostic astral religious beliefs" (19), and that salvation means "disentanglement from the malign influence of these astral powers, from the wheel of cosmic necessity to which man imagined himself to be bound" (25), is a contention which presupposes early Gnosticism before the Christian era, a questionable assumption at best, and which ignores other aspects of the Pauline view of salvation, especially the ethical emphasis of discipleship and bearing witness to the Kingdom of God.

⁴ Bandstra, *op. cit.*, pp. 171-75.

⁵ Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *Christian Origins and Judaism*, p. 159. Davies contends, however, that Paul's moral connotation of the "flesh" arises only in conflict with "influences of the Qumran type of idea" (160).

from their Lord is to show the extent of Christ's lordship over the powers as entities independent of men.

The descriptions in II Cor. 6 : 3-10 and 11 : 23-33 suffice to show that Paul spoke on the basis of authoritative experience when he declared his certainty that no sufferings can separate us from Jesus Christ. Were it not for the lordship of Christ over whatever powers there are in the universe, it would make no sense for Paul to appeal to the redemptive eschatology in creation ("in hope") as a means of substantiating his claim that the Christian's life with Christ is a pilgrimage from suffering to glory. At the same time, if that lordship could not be known and in a measure experienced by Christians, as Paul had experienced it, then the Lord of redemption would not be in touch with his creation, the bond between creation and redemption would be severed, and all talk of Christ's lordship would be both entirely docetic and a "false objectivation" without relevance to man's decision-making in day-to-day existence.¹ It is the Christian's experience of deliverance from the reality of these "principalities and powers," accordingly, which evidences the lordship of Christ.

The importance of the affirmation, which is made in Rom. 8, that Jesus has defeated and subjected the invisible powers, is seen in the fact that "in all the ancient confessions of faith, from the first and the opening of the second century," such an assertion is made.²

Was Paul developing an implication of Christ's lordship in Romans 8 : 18-39 or was he speaking to the existential needs of the Christian who must meet the condition of suffering with Christ? The preceding discussion intended to show that Paul did both, and that it is only from the first that the second can be evolved.

¹ Eduard Schweizer, "Two New Testament Creeds Compared (I Corinthians 15 : 3-5 and I Timothy 3 : 16)," *Neotestamentica*, p. 133.

² Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time*, p. 103. Cf. Werner Elert, *Der Ausgang der Altkirchlichen Christologie* (Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1957), who shows that according to the faith of the early Church the Logos as the second Person of the Trinity takes part in the work of creation.

It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss Cullmann's controversial hypothesis (*op. cit.*, pp. 191-210), based on the work of Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1909), of the relation between the invisible powers and the State. Cf. Cullmann, *The State in the New Testament* (New York: Scribner's, 1956).

II. ROMANS 5 : 12-21 (1 COR. 15 : 21 ff., 45 ff.)

The analogy between Adam and Christ which Paul draws in Rom. 5 : 12-21 points toward the anthropological factor in the relation between creation and redemption. First, the basic meaning of this typology in Paul's usage must be determined before investigation of its origin is undertaken as the second step.¹ Third, the implications of this text for the relation between creation and redemption will become apparent.

A) The purpose of Rom. 5 : 12-21 is indicated by the διὰ τοῦτο ("Therefore") of verse 12, which refers primarily to 5 : 1-11 and which provides evidence, in addition to and in further elucidation of that in 5 : 2-11, that "we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ."² That verses 1-11 are preparatory to verses 12-21 is also indicated by certain formal parallels between the two sections: whereas verses 1-11 contrast "we" and "him," verses 12-21 contrast "all" or "many" with "one man;" πολλῶ μᾶλλον occurs in verses 9-10 on one side of the διὰ τοῦτο and in verses 15 and 17 on the other.

¹ Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, p. xxiii rightly supports this procedure.

² Bernhard Weiss, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer*⁷ (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1886), p. 259; W. M. L. de Wette, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*⁸ (Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1841), p. 66; H. A. W. Meyer, *Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876), p. 240. J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Die heilige Schrift neuen Testaments*, II. 1-2 (Nördlingen: 1872), pp. 182-83, thinks that 5 : 12-21 refers to 5 : 1-11 since only in 5 : 2 does hope first appear as a theme, the purpose of 5 : 12-21 being to underline the *certainly* of redemption in Jesus Christ and salvation from God's wrath. Paul Althaus, *Der Brief an die Römer (Das Neue Testament Deutsch, VI)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949), p. 44, thinks that ultimately verse 12 refers to all the preceding part of the epistle, but especially to 5 : 1-11.

Other scholars think this phrase points back to all Paul had said before, notably Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), p. 20 (cf. pp. 209-12), who contends that 5 : 12-21 is "the high point of the epistle" which sets forth clearly the contrast between the two aeons or orders of existence. R. A. Lipsius, in Holtzmann *et al.* (eds.), *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, II (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893), 124, contends that verse 12 refers to 5 : 9-11. Rom. 5 : 12-21, however, is the conclusion to the whole of 1 : 18-5 : 21 (78). J. Bengel, *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*³ (London: David Nutt, 1855), p. 551, concerning διὰ τοῦτο: "Respicit totam tractionem superiorem..." F. W. Danker, "Romans V. 12. Sin Under Law," *NT St*, 14 (1968), 424-39, emphasizes that 5 : 13-14, 20 refers to νόμος, to which no explicit reference is made in 5 : 1-11, and thus concludes that 5 : 12-21 refers to the whole argument of Rom. 1-4.

Further, a number of important terms are common to both sections: ἁμαρτωλός, ἀποθνήσκω, δίκαιος, ζωή, θάνατος, κύριος, χάρις.¹

Rom. 5 : 12-21 carries forward the argument begun in 5 : 1-11 by means of describing the parallel between Adam and Christ and the contrasts between their work. Verses 13-17 are a most essential parenthesis following from and to be interpreted in the light of διὰ τοῦτο (and, therefore, in the light of 5 : 1-11), and preparatory to the conclusion reached in verses 18-21, as the ἄρα οὖν of verse 18 clearly indicates. Paul draws a parallel between Christ and Adam in verses 13-17 in order to indicate that the representative function of Jesus Christ in salvation "for many" is no less certain or extensive than Adam's representative function in sin—the latter being a concept already prevalent in Judaism in both apocalyptic and pseudepigraphical literature.² The efficacy of Christ's representative function is more certain, indeed, than that of Adam, as indicated by the πολλῶ μᾶλλον of verses 15 and 17 and the ὑπερπερίσσευσεν of verse 20.

The parallel between Christ and Adam—that both are representative of many (all)—is drawn in verses 13-17, however, only to provide the basis of comparison between the results of their representative work, and between their works themselves. In verses 18-21, where the summary statement is given,³ the parallel is one of *formal* relation (one-many) whereas the contrast is one of *material* content.⁴ The material contrast between Adam and Christ is ex-

¹ J. Cambier, *L'Évangile de Dieu selon l'Épître aux Romains* (Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967), pp. 200ff. emphasizes continuity from 5 : 1-11 to 5 : 12-21; cf. Cambier, "Péchés des Hommes et Pêché d'Adam en Rom. V. 12," *NTSt*, 11 (1964), 217-55. F. W. Danker, *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 425 n. 1, lists these seven terms.

² Cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*² (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), pp. 47ff. C. H. Dodd, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (London: Collins Fontana Books, 1959), pp. 100-01, thinks that the ancient concept of solidarity is behind the conception in 2 Esd. 3 : 21-22; 4 : 30; 7 : 118; etc., which held that through the Fall of Adam all men fell into sin.

³ Karl Barth, *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5* (*SJT Occasional Papers*, V; Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956), p. 44. Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus: Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5 : 12-21 (1 : Kor. 15)*, (Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962), pp. 255-78, summarizes his own position and his criticisms of the positions of Nygren and Karl Barth. Brandenburger shows a preference for gnostic conceptuality.

⁴ Charles Hodge, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*² (Philadelphia: H. B. Garner, 1883), p. 222, declares that verses 12, 18-19 contain the main idea of the passage so that the superabounding of grace is in a parenthetical section (verse 20) which replies to an incidental objection. The view of Sanday

pressed in several ways: verse 15b states the superiority of grace over sin; verses 16b–17 describe the superiority of the result of grace (lordship of life) over the result of sin (lordship of death); there is an implied superiority of the one act as bountiful grace over the other act as killing sin.¹

The great problem in the interpretation of Romans 5 : 12–21 is how to do justice to both the formal parallel and material contrast between Adam and Christ. Parallel and contrast meet in *τύπος τοῦ μέλλοντος* and *πολλῶ μᾶλλον*. The comparison is possible because of the similarity of the formal, structural one-many relation (Adam-man, Christ-man), whereas the contrast is necessary because of the dissimilarity between the works of grace and sin and between the effects of life and death (a relation of material content). If the “much more” emphasizes the contrast on the basis of the similarity, the “type” emphasizes the similarity underlying the contrasts. The analogy between Adam and Christ is drawn in these two formulae in such a way that Adam and Christ are not only united, but the former is subordinated to the latter, and the implication is made that there is both parallel and contrast between mankind in its situation and, on the other hand, the *imago dei*, who is Christ “the One who was to come” and after whom Adam was, as it were, patterned.

It is thus suggested that in spite of some eisegetical difficulties Karl Barth's understanding of the Pauline Adam-Christ typology is basically correct.² The primary basis of Paul's anthropology is Christology. Paul finds man's true nature in Christ. The basic reality of Paul's life and thought, including his thought about man, is Jesus “designated Son of God ... by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord” (Rom. 1 : 4; cf. I Thess. 1 : 2–10). Adam is not, then, representative of true humanity. In the words

and Headlam, *Romans* (New York, 1896), p. 133, that the superabounding of grace is “the keynote of the passage,” and that verses 18–21 “sum up the results of the whole comparison between Adam and Christ” (141), seems more probable.

¹ Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, p. 138; cf. pp. 18, 140.

² Karl Barth, *Christ and Adam*, pp. 21, 25. Cf. *infra* p. 56, footnote 1. Opposed to Barth's interpretation here are most scholars, especially important being: R. Bultmann, “Adam and Christ According to Romans 5,” in Snyder and Klassen (eds.), *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), pp. 143–65; Peter Lengersfeld, *Adam und Christus* (Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag Hubert Wingen AG, 1965), who is critical of both M. J. Scheeben and Karl Barth.

of Scroggs, who thinks Barth is here "correct in his general conclusions":

The humanity of Christ is prior to that of Adam in the sense that God's intent for man is prior to Adam's rebellion. Paul, of course, thinks of the Last Adam only as an eschatological reality, so that the question of a temporal priority does not arise. *Seen from the vantage point of the new creation*, Adam's humanity is indeed a derived, distorted humanity.¹

There is a continuum between mankind and Christ which cannot be erased by transgression (cf. the repeated πολλῷ μᾶλλον), and which involves more than a formal relation between a people and its representative (which formal relation is the only one that obtains between Adam and mankind). The result of Christ's representative work in redemption for all men is not only to bear the condemnation on the sin of all men but also to reverse the effect of Adam's (and mankind's, 5 : 12) sin in order that all men may become "types" of the One who came and who will come again, or, as Paul says elsewhere, in order that men may be "changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another; for this comes from the Lord who is the Spirit" (II Cor. 3 : 18; cf. Rom. 8 : 29; I Cor. 15 : 49).

It is the actual material contrast between Adam and Christ, however, which provided the occasion for drawing a parallel between them. Under Adam sin enters the κόσμος of mankind,² but on the other hand, under Christ "all men" experience proleptically the removal of condemnation and the granting of the new goal of

¹ Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, p. 101. The suggestion that "the coming one" is Moses, made by J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body* (SBT 5; London: SCM, 1957), p. 35 n. 1, and taken up by Scroggs, does not appear convincing.

² Rom. 5 : 12. The context of Rom. 1 : 8 and 5 : 12f. indicates in each instance that κόσμος means the world as man's dwelling place, as in Wisdom 2 : 24; Apoc. Moses 32. In other usages, the term refers to humanity itself both as fallen creatures and as the center of *Heilsgeschichte* (Rom. 3 : 6, 19; 11 : 12, 15; etc.), or to the totality of creation (synonymous with "heaven and earth" in the Old Testament and with τὰ πάντα in the New Testament). Cf. Hermann Sasse, "κοσμέω," in *TWNT*, III, 867-98.

Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 256, rightly maintains that for Paul κόσμος is an "eschatological concept." According to A. J. Bandstra, *op. cit.*, 48-57, in I Cor. 1 : 20-21; 3 : 18-19 κόσμος and αἰών are interchangeable and virtually synonymous, so that when the κόσμος is redeemed it ceases to be κόσμος, but is rather called "aeon," "creation," or "heaven and earth." In Gal. 4 : 3 and Col. 2 : 8, 20 the κόσμος is not structurally evil in itself, but apart from Christ and his Spirit it becomes an arena of evil activity, and of the κόσμος in this latter sense the στοιχεῖα are the "basic components" (57).

δικαίωσις ζωῆς,¹ and the interim until that goal is reached is one of the reign of grace.

Though it is the merit of Karl Barth's interpretation of Rom. 5 : 12-21 that the contrasts between Adam and Christ are not allowed to overshadow the similarity between them, the difficulty with Barth's interpretation is that the distinction between the anthropological and cosmic effects of Adam's work and, on the other hand, of Christ's work is obscured as the continuity between mankind (in Adam) and Christ overshadows the discontinuity between them. Barth has rightly gone beyond traditional exegesis in stressing that the similarity between Christ and Adam is more than that of formal representative function, for this similarity includes also a *prefiguring* by the "type" (Adam) of the "Coming One" (Christ) so that Adam is to be understood from the standpoint of that which he prefigures (Christ). On the other hand, the major weakness of Barth's exegesis is that what Barth says about man as a whole is developed too directly from what is said about Jesus Christ and Christians in him.² That is, Barth has rightly shown that Christ is related to all men not only formally as representative but also materially and ontologically as the real *imago Dei*, for to deny this would be Docetic. There is need for an additional distinction, however, between Christ *with* and *for* all men, and, on the other hand, *in* Christians.

This distinction is drawn in the text itself which speaks of those who actively "receive the abundance of grace and the free gift of righteousness" (5 : 17). The universal terms ("all men" and "many")

¹ Only in Rom. 4 : 25 and 5 : 18 does the noun δικαίωσις occur in N.T. Bo Reicke, "Paul's Understanding of Righteousness," in J. M. Richards (ed.), *Soli Deo Gloria* (Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1968), pp. 48-49, rightly argues that "Paul's conception of justification was collective, not atomistic," and that in Rom. 1-5 Paul's way of thinking "is not forensic, but dynamic and collective."

² Barth does this in spite of his own warning against developing anthropology "too directly" from Christology. Cf. Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, III. 2 (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1960), pp. 2, 47, etc. John G. Gibbs, "A Secondary Point of Reference in Barth's Anthropology," *SJT*, XVI (1963), 132-35, shows that in *Church Dogmatics* III. 2 Barth develops anthropology primarily from Christology but also from a secondary point of reference. The similarity and dissimilarity between Jesus Christ and human nature are more clearly described by Barth in *Church Dogmatics*, IV. 2, 25-28. Lengsfeld, *Adam und Christus*, pp. 213-26, agrees that in *C. D.* IV Barth is closer to Paul's thought than in *C. D.* I or *C. D.* III, but he thinks that Barth makes Adam and Christ into mere symbols of a divinely decreed predestination.

are corporate rather than exhaustive in connotation. Paul's Adamic Christology is eschatological, but Barth's is non-eschatological. Though the main import of this text is its emphasis on the continuum between Christ and all humanity, a continuum which makes possible that the benefits of Christ may be extended to all men, yet the distinction is maintained between soteriology and anthropology.¹

B) Since Paul assumed that his readers were familiar with Adamic typology and since a polemical interest has been alleged in I Cor. 15 : 45ff., the question arises in what circle(s) of thought the typology originated. Hellenistic gnostic myth and Hellenistic Judaism have been two of the most important answers suggested. The syncretism of Paul's time renders difficult, however, any clean-cut final decision, as the following discussion indicates.

The fact is that no "*Urmensch*" myth, such as Reitzenstein suggested, has been found. At best we have only a composite construct dependent on such diverse spheres of influence as Indian, Islamic, Persian, Jewish and Christian sources.² Not surprisingly, the suggestion that the Adam-Christ typology was indebted to such an hypothetical concept of a glorious first creature or gnostic savior-myth has been widely attacked.³ Recent study of Nag Hammadi materials shows, for example, that the Pauline Adam-Christ analogy is far removed from the Apocryphon of John or any similar gnostic ideas.⁴

Others have suggested, rather, that when he wrote Rom. 5 : 12-21 and I Cor. 15 : 22ff., 45ff. Paul was consciously opposing Philo's position, in his exegesis of Gen. 1 and 2, that there must be a

¹ Cambier, *NTSt*, 11 (1964), 217-55, distinguishes between Paul's anthropology and later ecclesiastical statements; cf. Cambier, *Romains*, p. 216.

² R. Reitzenstein, *Poimandres* (Leipzig, 1904). The myth thus inferred is described by R. Bultmann, *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting* (New York: Meridian Living Age, 1956), pp. 163f.

³ The general methods by which the *Urmensch* myth was proposed have been vigorously attacked by Carsten Colpe, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961), p. 191.

⁴ W. C. van Unnik, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (SBT 30; London: SCM, 1960), p. 93; cf. pp. 71-79. Sasague Arai, "Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes," *NTSt*, 15 (1969), 302-18, observes that the longer codices II and IV are a Christian reworking of a non-Christian original which was probably closer to the shorter codices III and BG of Nag Hammadi. Thus, all sections in which Christ appears are interpolations, and "the Christology is secondary." Cf. Hans Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 338 n. 41.

distinction between a "heavenly man" (Gen. 1) and an "earthly man" (Gen. 2).¹ The first Adam was the Son of Man, man as God created him. The last Adam was sinful man, not created in the image of God, and coming up from the earth rather than down from heaven. Against that position Paul makes clear that there is only one first Adam, and that the prototype of man comes later in Jesus Christ. Human nature in itself is not bad, accordingly, for human nature is patterned after Christ. The same emphasis is made in Col. 3 : 9-10 and Eph. 4 : 24.²

Recently Robin Scroggs has argued convincingly, on the other hand, that this position results from a misinterpretation of Philo. Philo was not interested in comparing an historical Adam with a mythical *Urmensch*, and Philo's Adamic material is distinct from the heavenly man in three respects. The origin of the former is rabbinic, but the latter is from Greek sources; the character of the former is mythical, but the latter is philosophic; the function of the former is "to show the perfect, ideal man, that can never more exist on this earth, while the heavenly and earthly men are used to construct the ontology of every man."³

¹ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 47; Matthew Black, "Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT*, VII (1954), 171-72; Joachim Jeremias, "Ἀδὰμ," *TWNT*, I, 141-43. This position was taken in the dissertation that forms the original substance of this book.

² Eduard Schweizer, "The Son of Man Again," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich, 1963), pp. 85-92, contends, concerning the source of the Last Adam conception, that Christian writers, when speaking of a Christ-logos, pre-existence, or a *kosmokrator*, were making use of current ideas of their time without engaging in discussion or controversy, necessarily, with pre-Christian ideas. "In a similar way Paul uses the concept of a Wisdom-Christology or of a *kosmokrator* without being directly dependent on these speculations, neither accepting nor rejecting them explicitly, but using a term which was in the air, without reflecting about its origin" (90-91). Jesus used the term "Son of Man" because it was not a definite title, then there was a "re-apocalypticization" of Jesus' eschatology by a Jewish-Christian group, for whom "the decisive witness in the last judgment became the judge himself" (Rom. 2 : 16; 3 : 6; II Cor. 5 : 10; I Cor. 4 : 4-5). (89-90)

Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament*, pp. 166-81, concludes that Jesus' self-designation as Son of Man is the primary source of Paul's Adam-Christology, especially evident in I Cor. 15 : 45ff.; Rom. 5 : 12ff.; Phil. 2 : 5ff. Cf. also Gösta Lindeskog, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," in Anton Fridrichsen *et al.*, *The Root of the Vine* (London: Dacre Press, 1953), p. 16.

Though the term "second Adam" is commonly used with reference to Paul's thought, the term which Paul uses is "last Adam" (I Cor. 15 : 45).

³ Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, p. 122; cf. pp. 115-22. Frederick Houk Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967),

A third alternative, namely that the *Urmensch* myth had influenced the Jewish Adam-speculations on which Paul depended, has been effectively contested by Jacob Jervell and later by R. Scroggs.¹ For instance, in opposition to the *Urmensch*, Adam as the *microcosmos* (II Enoch 30 : 8-10, 13; Sib. Oracles III, 24-26) does not exist before the world nor is the world made from him, but rather he is the climax of the world and is made from the world.

In view of difficulties with either gnostic myth or Hellenistic Judaism as primary sources of Adam-Christ typology, it seems best to conclude that Paul's ready references to that typology were facilitated by the myth of Adam as bearer of sin and death (Gen. 2f.), descriptions of an exalted first man by the Yahwist and in Priestly materials, and by presence of the Adamic myth in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha.²

The statement of I Cor. 15 : 21f. that death came through Adam is in agreement with IV Ezra 3 : 7; 7 : 116-26; Sirach 25 : 24; Apoc. Mosis 28; II Bar. 17 : 3; 19 : 8. The deed of the first pair leads to a cancerous growth of sin among mankind (yet individual responsibility for sin is usually maintained), according to IV Ezra 3 : 26; 4 : 30; 7 : 92, 116-26; Sir. 25 : 24; II Bar. 54 : 15, 19. There is no ontological estrangement between man and the world (as in gnostic thought), so that the creation may be caused to suffer under man's sin (Rom. 8 : 18ff.; cf. Gen. 3 : 14-19; 6; Is. 24 : 5; 33 : 9; Jer. 12 : 4, 11; I Enoch 2-5 : 3; 7 : 5-6; and cf. Mark 13 : 19), or in mythic terms, Adam corrupts and distorts the perfect world intended by God (IV Ezra 7 : 11; Sir. 40 : 1-11; Jub. 3 : 28; II Bar. 56 : 6; Apoc. Mosis 8 : 2; 24). Especially significant is it that these Jewish sources used the Adamic myth to convey their anthropology, for Paul's

pp. 242f., however, while not postulating that Paul directly depended on Philo, finds their teachings "similar."

¹ J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 39, 41; Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, pp. 113-14. Jervell maintains that the *Urmensch* concept did influence later rabbinic teaching (99), and he thinks that Paul is to be interpreted from gnostic sources (41-42, n. 73). E. Schweizer, "Die Kirche als Leib Christi...", *Neotestamentica*, pp. 278ff., maintains that Paul's typology of Christ-Adam is indebted to late-Jewish "Urmensch Adam."

² This conclusion, as Scroggs makes clear, does not confine Paul's indebtedness to Jewish or Christian sources, for "hints of Hellenistic or gnostic tradition are likely to be found" in both Hellenism and Paul (xxiv), but not of sufficient importance or frequency to alter the conclusion. Scroggs points to prominence of Adamic myth also in rabbinic thought of third century or earlier (32).

Adam-Christ typology describes the implications of Christ's lordship for anthropology.¹

The greater emphasis on chronological sequence in I Cor. 15 must be understood in light of the *Urzeit-Endzeit* concept of Paul's contemporary Judaism, for also in I Cor. 15 the substantival content of the Adam-Christ typology, which is especially evident in Rom. 5, is present.² Similarly, a cyclical world-view is not intended by the substantival anthropology of Rom. 5, for the new creation implicit in 5:12-21 is discontinuous as well as continuous with the old creation.³ The contention that Rom. 5 contains two forms of Christology, namely substitutionary or juristic Jewish (5:1-11), which transforms the gnostic (5:12-21) mythological cosmology into salvation history, cannot be sustained.⁴

¹ Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, pp. xxii, 29, 59, 83. These sources had a "substantival" view of man along with their ethical or "decisional understanding" (60).

Following the assumption of general gnostic influence in Corinth, Egon Brandenburger, *Adam und Christus*, pp. 70f., 77-109, has argued that the Adam-Christ correspondence was borrowed from the Corinthians. Scroggs, *op. cit.*, pp. xx-xxii, etc., shows, however, that I Cor. 15 weaves around this motif "elements crucial to Paul" such as resurrection, life-giving Spirit, Christ as *εἰκὼν*, *ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ*, etc. Cf. E. Jüngel, "Das Gesetz zwischen Adam und Christus," *ZTK*, LX (1963), 42-74, for critique of Brandenburger's thesis. A. Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (*Études Bibliques*; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), pp. 333-39 contends that Rom. 5:12ff. depends on Wisdom (especially 2:24) and its contrast between death and life. Sanday and Headlam, *Romans*, pp. 51f., 267ff., find "clear indications of the use by the Apostle of the Book of Wisdom."

² Scroggs, *op. cit.*, pp. 62f. Cf. Otto Piper, review of Barth, *Christ and Adam* in *JBL*, LXXVII (1958), 180f.; W. G. Kümmel, *Das Neue Testament*, pp. 468, 474. N. A. Dahl, "Christ, Creation, and the Church," in Davies and Daube (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 425-29, describes forms of correlation between protology and eschatology.

³ So argues Gerhard Schneider, *Neuschöpfung oder Wiederkehr? (Eine Untersuchung zum Geschichtsbild der Bibel)*, (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1961), p. 90. Concerning the dynamic meaning of *καινὴ κτίσις*, cf. Roy A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," *JBL*, LXXIV (1955), 69-79, who concludes that *νέος* and *καινός* are synonymous and both imply qualitative as well as temporal newness, and that there are four aspects of newness present through the New Testament: contrast (Mk. 14:24-25; Heb. 8:8-13; etc.), continuity (Heb. 8:13, etc.), dynamic (Mk. 2:21-22; Rom. 12:2; Col. 3:10), and finality (Heb. 6:4-6).

⁴ The contention was made by R. Bultmann, "Adam and Christ According to Romans 5," in Klassen and Snyder (eds.), *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, pp. 150-51, 165.

C) The continuity of argument in both parts of Rom. 5 and Paul's probable indebtedness primarily to Jewish use of the Adamic myth to teach anthropology thus indicate important implications of Paul's Adam-Christ typology for the relation between creation and redemption. There is an ontological relation between "our Lord Jesus Christ" and all men, a relation which means that the redemptive history which has accomplished "peace" among Christians (5 : 1) continues to reach forward through the abounding of grace in a way that is fully sufficient for the life and righteousness of all men (5 : 18ff.). Paul's thought is not merely existential but also cosmological, not merely soteriological but also anthropological.¹ The relation between Adam and Christ makes sense only if there is an intrinsic connection between the creation of man and the redemption of man, a connection of dynamic ontology.

These two sections of Romans suffice to establish not only that the lordship of Christ over the creation was a theme of major importance in Paul's thought, but also that it was an emphasis clearly differentiated from that of justification by faith.

First, the "cosmic liturgy" of 8 : 19ff. constitutes the first in a series of evidences that one's suffering with Christ does not mean that he is abandoned to condemnation (8 : 1) but rather that the righteousness which has been reckoned to us (4 : 3, 24) will reach its consummation in glory (8 : 18). The Lord over Christians is the Lord over the cosmic totality. Frustration and meaninglessness are not intended by God to be the final destiny of that totality. The liberty of Christians within this totality, especially manifest in their deliverance from evil's domination, becomes evidence, in turn, that nothing can separate us from God's love, thus that everything is destined to be under Christ's lordship.

Second, the special relation between Christians and Christ presupposes the continuum between Christ and man that was expressed by the Adam-Christ typology. To be sure, this anthropology was not of interest for its own sake, but it is of utmost interest to the Christian to know that he *as a person* was made "much more" for the free gift of grace than for the condemnation placed on sin. Indeed, that certainty has been so well underscored that immedi-

¹ Especially helpful is the discussion of existential and cosmological themes in Paul's view of Adam and Christ in C. K. Barrett, *From First Adam To Last*, pp. 20-21; cf. pp. 73, 90.

ately Paul had to guard against misunderstanding: "What shall we say then? Are we to continue to sin that grace may abound? By no means!" (6 : 1-2)

It is clear in both of these texts that Paul is not single-mindedly pursuing only ethical concerns and subordinating everything to his anthropological theme, nor on the other hand is he engaging in metaphysical speculation. The choice between either ethic-centered theology or cosmic-centered theology is a false choice, for the fact is that Paul wrote about both ethical-anthropological and cosmic themes to the extent that each is implied by Jesus' lordship.¹ For Paul that lordship was neither a speculative matter of cosmology nor a subjective phenomenon of inner experience of justification alone. Christ's lordship in both creation and redemption cannot be avoided in Paul's thought. The central focus of his thought is that lordship and neither creation alone nor redemption alone.

¹ This widely proposed false alternative has been especially clearly stated and supported by Heinz Schwantes, *Schöpfung der Endzeit* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962), pp. 20, 25, 43-52, 94.

CHAPTER FOUR

CREATION AND REDEMPTION ACCORDING TO PAUL'S USE OF TRADITION (I Cor. 8 : 6; Phil. 2 : 6-11)

Paul's use of tradition is a further indication of his own thought, for he would not likely quote approvingly material with which he disagreed. The tradition itself, so used, is evidence of pre-Pauline thought which directly influenced Paul.

I Cor. 8 : 6 and Phil. 2 : 6-11, two important texts which relate creation and redemption, have been judged by many to be pre-Pauline. If that judgment is correct, our investigation of the relation between creation and redemption may proceed a further step through the access which these texts provide both to pre-Pauline tradition and to Paul's thought in two other writings besides the letter to the Romans.

I. I CORINTHIANS 8 : 6

(Cf. Rom. 11 : 36; I Cor. 2 : 8; Eph. 4 : 5-6; Col. 1 : 16)

I Cor. 8 : 6 represents an unquestioned article of faith according to which the relation between creation and redemption was a normative part of the earliest Church's proclamation.¹ The circumstance that Paul mentions the cosmological work of Christ only incidentally in an ethical section, indicates that belief in the cosmic Christ was shared in common by Paul and the early Church, so much so that Paul could cite that belief without elaboration and expect its acceptance by the Corinthians as a matter of course.

The importance of the text consists primarily in its being the first instance in New Testament literature that a part in the work of creation is assigned to Christ.² This earliest text not only applies

¹ Cf. John Coolidge Hurd, Jr., *The Origin of I Corinthians* (London: S.P.C.K., 1965), p. 68; pp. 278ff.; 290-91.

² Hans Lietzmann, "Symbolstudien," *ZNW*, XXII (1923), 268ff., 272f. V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (NTTS, V; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963), pp. 67-68, agrees that "the earliest bipartite forms mentioned Jesus the Lord before they did God the Father (as in Eph. 4.5, 6)..."

the term "Lord" to Jesus in a formal way,¹ but also mentions Christ and God together in connection with creation. Later Rom. 11 : 29-36 mentions only God in connection with creation and Col. 1 : 15-20 speaks only of Christ's work in creation.

The procedure to be followed here is: first, examination of the structure of the verse; second, study of the problem of lordship in the verse and its context; third, description of the gnosis to which the verse speaks; fourth, comparison of the meaning of the verse with the *religionsgeschichtliche* influences which have been alleged for this verse.

A) I Cor. 8 : 6 is constructed in parallel members,² and the relation between the two affirmations is determined by the circumstance that only the preposition *διὰ* is used in the second affirmation though *ἐξ* and *εἰς* are used in the first affirmation. Though it is generally agreed that *ἐξ* refers here to the source of creation and *εἰς* refers to the goal, considerable thought has been given to the meaning of the *διὰ* clauses.³ The careful balancing of parallel members indicates that *διὰ* does not designate an intermediary being between God and man, a third being who is neither God nor man (which is Philo's usage of *διὰ* in contrast to *ὑπό* in *Legum allegoriae* I, 41). Rather, *διὰ* carries an instrumental meaning and implies the pre-existence of Christ, as does the description of Christ as the Rock in

Cf. E.-B. Allo, *Saint Paul, Première épître aux Corinthiens* (Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1935), p. 201; Oscar Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London: Lutterworth, 1949), p. 42; cf. pp. 38-39. When the bipartite formula was used at baptism, contends Cullmann, the gift received in baptism, namely the Spirit, was added (cf. Eph. 4 : 4), so that creeds of several articles were formed.

Concerning the earliest Christology, John H. Hayes, "The Resurrection as Enthronement and the Earliest Church Christology," *Interp.* XXII (1968), 333-45, has argued convincingly that "the earliest Christology was based on an interpretation of the Resurrection as Jesus' enthronement as the Messiah in the heavenly sphere at the right hand of God" (345). Hayes provides useful summaries of the positions on this matter of J. A. T. Robinson, Reginald Fuller (about same as F. Hahn), Norman Perrin, and R. Bultmann (similar to J. Weiss).

¹ Cf. the primitive homologia, "Jesus is Lord," in I Cor. 12 : 3, Rom. 10 : 9, Phil. 2 : 11, and the discussion by Neufeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-44; Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), p. 223.

² J. Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 223.

³ Cf. Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), pp. 347ff.; Robert M. Grant, "Causation and 'The Ancient World View,'" *JBL*, LXXXIII (1964), 34-36.

I Cor. 10 : 4.¹ Since the basic use of the *kyrios* title is to refer to the present rule of Jesus as risen Lord, the use of this title to refer to Jesus' pre-existent function as mediator of creation "must be derived from faith in the present Lord."² Jesus is the one *Kyrios* and exercises present lordship in two ways as indicated by the two *διὰ* clauses in the second affirmation of I Cor. 8 : 6.

The first affirmation of I Cor. 8 : 6 distinguishes between creation (*τὰ πάντα*) and redemption (*ἡμεῖς*),³ and the second affirmation maintains this distinction by using *διὰ* twice to refer to both *τὰ πάντα* and *ἡμεῖς*,⁴ thereby indicating that through the mediatorial work of "one Lord Jesus Christ" creation and redemption are distinguished in their unity as dual aspects of the one lordship of Jesus Christ. The difference between creation and redemption is that only the latter is moving in accord with the Father's purpose, only the latter is *εἰς αὐτόν*. The unity between creation and redemption is maintained since all things come from God the Father and through the Lord Jesus Christ.

This verse seems to imply that: (a) only as Christians live redemptively in the midst of all things can the time come when all things, as well as Christians, are *εἰς αὐτόν*; and (b) that this influence of Christians on all things is made possible by the fact that the one Lord Jesus Christ rules over both the things which have been created and those who are Christians, so that the final unity of creation and redemption depends on the dual mediatorial lordship of Jesus Christ. If these are legitimate implications from the verse,

¹ Cf. Prov. 8 : 15-16; Wisd. 8 : 10-13; Oepke, *TWNT*, II, 66; Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 201. Harald Hegermann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU, 82; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), p. 132 n. 2, contends that the "Schöpfungsmittler-Christologie" was quite influential in the early Hellenistic Church, and that I Cor. 8 : 6 does speak of pre-existence, and argues against exaggeration of the motif of discipleship by E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern*² (ATANT, 28; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962), with whom, however, Hegermann has many points of agreement.

² Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (1959), pp. 247-48. Cf. Rom. 10 : 6-9.

³ Clinton D. Morrison, *The Powers That Be* (SBT, 29; London: SCM, 1960), p. 118, footnote 1; *TWNT*, III, 883-87; Andrew John Bandstra, *The Law and the Elements of the World* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1964), p. 49; Adolf Schlatter, *Paulus der Bote Jesu, eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther* (Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934), p. 255.

⁴ Schlatter, *op. cit.*, p. 256; Robertson and Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*² (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1914), p. 168.

one would see here in seminal form a theme which later became prominent in Rom. 8 : 18–25, namely the theme of the dependence of the creation on “the glorious liberty of the children of God.”

To summarize the significance of the διὰ clauses, they refer to: the mediatorship of Christ in both creation and redemption, the pre-existence of Christ which is implied by that mediatorship, and the unity of his work in creation and redemption.

B) The meaning of I Cor. 8 : 6 is intimately bound up with its context, further, for the context provides a contrast to the “one Kyrios” and “one God” and, in addition, shows the relevance of the confession of faith for a particular ethical problem.

What was Paul's attitude toward the θεοί πολλοί καὶ κύριοι πολλοί? The clause ὥσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ is to be found between the preceding statement about λεγόμενοι θεοὶ and the following affirmation of faith in the one God, so that this clause cannot be taken to mean that Paul believed in other gods alongside the one God.¹ It is to be observed, further, that in I Cor. 8 : 5–6 Paul does not disagree with the Corinthians' denial of other gods, but rather provides confirmatory elucidation of the statements in their letter which he probably quotes in 8 : 4.²

Though it is clear that for Paul there is but one Lord in an ultimate sense (cf. Rom. 8 : 38–39; Phil. 2 : 9–11; Col. 1 : 15–20; Eph. 4 : 5), there are also other realities in this world which may be called angelic or demonic beings (cf. Col. 2 : 8; Eph. 3 : 10; Rom. 13 : 1–7; I Cor. 10 : 20). One of Paul's concerns in I Cor. 8 : 4–6 is the relation between the κύριος and these other realities. As Jean Héring has maintained, Paul's thought is at this point influenced by Jewish angelology:

For if pagan gods such as Zeus, Hermes (cf. Acts 14 : 12) or Artemis (cf. Acts 19 : 26ff.) do not exist, there were nevertheless, according to Jewish theology, which Paul follows, a number of angelic beings of great power which men might be tempted to worship and which are sometimes called ‘gods.’ The chief Old Testament

¹ There are ample differences between the κύριοι of the Hellenistic mystery religions and the κύριος of Christians, concerning which cf. Neufeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 59–60; D. E. H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964), p. 104.

² Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 200. Cf. J. C. Hurd, Jr., *op. cit.*, pp. 68, 278ff., 290–91, who provides a “table” of “scholarly opinion affirming the presence in I Corinthians of quotations from the Corinthians' letter.”

texts relating to this are Psalms 81 : 1 (82 : 1), 97 : 7 (Hebrew), and 138 : 1 (Hebrew).¹

Paul's conception of pagan gods is in accord with the view expressed in the Septuagint that heathen gods are demons (δαιμόνια).² The pagan deities themselves are unreal and mere fictions, but there is behind men's worship of them a reality which must be taken into account, as he makes plain in I Cor. 10 : 20 : "...what pagans sacrifice they sacrifice to demons and not to God."³ In Gal. 4 : 8 Paul is emphatic that heathen gods do not exist, so that his meaning in I Cor. 10 : 20 must be that "there were supernatural powers behind the idols, although not the gods which the idols represented."⁴

Paul's recognition of supernatural powers behind idolatry is an important part of his view of the relation between creation and redemption, for he makes clear that whatever powers or angelic realities there be are ultimately subject to the lordship of Jesus Christ.⁵

The contrast in this passage, moreover, is not primarily between those who acknowledge the lordship of Christ and, on the other hand, those who worship many gods and lords, but is rather between Christians who exist *for* God the Father and other beings (such as the angelic powers) who (or which), though created *from* the Father and *through* one Lord Jesus Christ, nevertheless do *not* exist *for* God the Father. That is to say, the lordship of Jesus is not limited merely to those who acknowledge it, for his lordship over all things was being exercised through his mediatorship in the work of creation before he became, or was made, the Mediator in the work of redemption.⁶

¹ Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Epworth Press, 1962), pp. 68-69. Héring refers also to Slav. Enoch 20 : 1 and Eth. Enoch 61 : 10 "where terms equivalent to 'kuriotetes' denote groups of angels" (p. 69, footnote 9).

² Cf. the Septuagint of Psalms 96 : 5 and 106 : 37; Deut. 32 : 17; also cf. Baruch 4 : 7 and Rev. 9 : 20. All of the preceding speak of gods as δαιμόνια. Cf. the discussion by Werner Foerster, "δαίμων," in *TWNT*, II (1935), 1-21, especially 12.

³ Cf. F. L. Godet, *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, I (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957, reprint of 1886 edition by T. & T. Clark), 414f.

⁴ Cf. Robertson and Plummer, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

⁵ Lucien Cerfaux, "Le Titre 'Kyrios' et la dignité royale de Jésus," *RSPT*, XII (1923), 150.

⁶ Eduard Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², p. 112, correctly maintains that I Cor. 8 : 6 does not express an *Hellenistic* view of the "physisch

There is expressed here, accordingly, a practical if not philosophical monotheism. In 8 : 4-5 there is a distinction between the real God and all false gods, "so-called gods," and in 8 : 6 there is the relation between the one real God and the cosmic totality.¹ Since Paul makes similar contentions elsewhere, I Cor. 8 : 4-6 may be taken to be representative of Paul's thought on this subject. For example, Paul reports having heard that the Thessalonians "turned to God from idols, to serve a living and true God" (I Thess. 1 : 9). God is God of Jews and Gentiles alike because "God is one" (Rom. 3 : 30), and "the same Lord is Lord of all" (Rom. 10 : 12). Paul writes to the Galatians: "Formerly, when you did not know God, you were in bondage to beings that by nature are no gods; but now that you have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how can you turn back again to the weak and beggarly elemental spirits, whose slaves you want to be once more?" (Gal. 4 : 8-9.)²

C) A second problem which arises from I Cor. 8 : 1-5 is the meaning of *γνώσις*. The opening words of chapter eight ("now concerning") indicate that Paul is about to deal with another item mentioned in the letter sent by the Corinthians to him.³ Evidently the Corinthians had contended in their letter that they had enough knowledge to know that there are no other gods than the one God and one Lord, so eating sacrificial meats would mean nothing to them.⁴ Paul sees that beyond their exterior orthodoxy, however, certain ethical problems are raised by the Corinthians' attitude, namely the problem of what Christian *γνώσις* is and the problem of responsibility for one's brother.

The Corinthians were excessively proud of their *γνώσις* (I Cor. 1 : 5; 4 : 10). Against this misconception of *γνώσις* Paul replies:

zu denkende Abhängigkeit des Universums" from Jesus, and yet that I Cor. 8 : 6 declares "...dass es für 'uns' heute keinen anderen Herrn geben kann, weil Jesus der alles umfassende Herr ist."

¹ Cf. Dom Jacques Dupont, O.S.B., *Gnosis, la Connaissance religieuse dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1949), p. 329; Robertson and Plummer, *op. cit.*, pp. 167-68; Hans Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (K-EKNT)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), p. 172.

² Cf. also Acts 17 : 26; 19 : 26; I Cor. 11 : 12; Eph. 4 : 6; Col. 1 : 16-20; Rom. 11 : 36; and concerning Gal. 4 : 8, cf. Mk. 12 : 29, 32; Deut. 6 : 4; 4 : 35; Ex. 20 : 2-3. Cf. Dupont, *op. cit.*, pp. 333-45.

³ Allo, *op. cit.*, p. 196. Cf. I Cor. 7 : 1, 25; 12 : 1; 16 : 1, 12.

⁴ F. L. Godet, *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, I (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957, reprint of 1886 edition by T. & T. Clark), 401-02.

" 'Knowledge' puffs up, but love builds up." (8 : 1.) The issue with which Paul deals here is not whether there are other gods, as has been seen, but whether γνῶσις is being developed in a libertine manner without concern for the brethren. It is not the amount of knowledge but the quality of knowledge which counts.¹ The Christian must take care, accordingly, "while using his liberty not only not to destroy others, but also not to destroy himself (IX. 23-X. 22)."²

It then becomes clear what Christian γνῶσις is. Paul's main concern in I Cor. 8 : 1-3, and a concern to which he returns in 8 : 7-13, is that the Corinthians' γνῶσις will act responsibly for the brethren and for the unity of the gospel. The way to valid γνῶσις is to love God, which means to be known by him (8 : 3; cf. I Cor. 13 : 12; Gal. 4 : 9). As Hering points out:

... 'to have been known by God' (and observe again the use of the perfect '*egnostai*') is almost synonymous with 'to have been chosen by Him'. It is just the same in the well-known passage, Romans 8 : 28-30, which confirms for us the close association between the two ideas. Love for God is therefore the true sign of election and the only token of true gnosis.³

But in addition, as Paul would have it, to love God and to be known by him is to love the brethren.

Paul's attack against the Corinthian misconception of γνῶσις does not mean that he is against all γνῶσις. "Brethren, do not be children in your thinking; be babes in evil, but in thinking be mature" (I Cor. 14 : 20). If valid Christian γνῶσις does not lead to confusion among the brethren, this is because the content of the Christian γνῶσις is itself not chaotic nor in confusion. There is no absolute antithesis between "words" and "demonstration" (I Cor. 2 : 4), but only between words "taught by human wisdom" and words "taught by the Spirit" (2 : 13), or between a "wisdom of this age" and a "wisdom of God" (2 : 6-7).⁴ It is to be expected, indeed, that this

¹ R. P. C. Spicq, "Épîtres aux Corinthiens," in Louis Pirot (ed.), *La Sainte Bible*, XI (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951), 226. Cf. Dupont, *op. cit.*, p. 252: "L'objet de cette gnose apparaît clairement être en relation avec la vie morale."

² Godet, *op. cit.*, I, 405.

³ Hering, *op. cit.*, p. 68. Cf. C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," *NTSt*, 11 (1965), 138-53.

⁴ Emil Brunner, *Das Missverständnis der Kirche* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951), p. 47, quite misses Paul's point when he cites I Cor. 2 : 4

gnosis will be imparted not only by demonstration but also by words and careful thinking. That this gnosis is not esoteric nor productive of either theoretical or ethical confusion is made clear by the circumstance that its unity (1 : 18-31, etc.), its interpretation (2 : 13), its meaning (14 : 26), and its orderliness (14 : 40) are guaranteed by the source of Christian gnosis (Spirit, God, Christ are all mentioned in I Cor. 2 as the source). "For God is not a God of confusion but of peace" (I Cor. 14 : 33). Paul's concern for the prophetic ministry as an impartation of edifying gnosis within the Christian community (I Cor. 14) may well indicate that valid Christian gnosis will not multiply the diverse implications of the *παράδοσις* to the neglect or detriment of the unifying implications of the *παράδοσις* as expressed in the *ὁμολογία*.¹

It is important to observe, then, that this early confession of faith occurs in Paul's epistle because it serves his purpose in discussing the responsibility of the "strong" to the "weak." The agreed-upon *παράδοσις* expressed in I Cor. 8 : 6 does not justify every kind of *γνώσις* because the *κύριος*, of whom the *παράδοσις* speaks, died for the brother (8 : 11) who could even be "destroyed" (in spite of the Lord's work) because of an invalid *γῶσις*. Sin against the brother in this way is sin against Christ (8 : 12) who is the one Lord (8 : 6). The ethical quality of Christian *γῶσις* cannot be ignored when considering its relationship to various kinds of Gnosticism, as will be seen.

Knowledge of Jesus' lordship requires that the Corinthians live *εἰς αὐτόν*, and that they thereby become instruments of God's redemptive purpose within the world. The distinction between the source and goal of creation and redemption, on the one hand, and the Mediator of creation and redemption, on the other, presupposes but does not explain the relation between *θεός* and *κύριος*. There is no encouragement in that concise assertion for posturing as initiates

and 4 : 20 in support of his antithesis between word (or theology) and spirit, a contention which leads toward a conclusion which is reminiscent of Rudolf Sohm: "Das Kirchen-Recht ist Geist-Substitut" (51).

¹ This conception is indebted to a lecture by Otto Piper in a seminar on the Apostle Paul held at Princeton Theological Seminary, May, 1961. Cf. Neufeld, *op. cit.*, who suggests that "the *homologia* represented the agreement or consensus in which the Christian community was united, that core of essential conviction and belief to which Christians subscribed and openly testified" (20); and who describes the relation between *παράδοσις*, *κήρυγμα* and *διδαχή* (28-29).

into great hidden mysteries or for speculating about real and unreal gods, but on the contrary every encouragement to see that the quality of life in the Corinthian congregation reflects the true position of Christians as people who exist "for" God the Father and "through" the "one Lord Jesus Christ" in a world that came from God and is destined for him through Jesus Christ. Alleged knowledge of God which does not mean love for him and for the brother is only "imagined" knowledge (8 : 2), no matter how accurately the precise wording of a mutual confession of faith is quoted.

D) It remains to determine what circle of thought most likely could have produced a confession which would mean what it did in Paul's usage of it, for there is no apparent contradiction between the Pauline context and the confession.

Many scholars have emphasized the Hellenistic background of I Cor. 8 : 6. Weinel and J. Weiss were two of the first scholars to contend for a gnostic background behind Paul's conception of the cosmic work of Christ in I Cor. 8 : 6.¹ Eduard Norden thought that I Cor. 8 : 6, along with Rom. 11 : 33ff., Col. 1 : 16f., Eph. 4 : 5f., and Heb. 2 : 10, were indebted to Stoicism and were Hellenistic formulae.² Lietzmann agreed with Reitzenstein that being known by God (8 : 3b) is a conception of Hellenistic mysticism, according to which "die Gnosis ist das Einswerden mit Gott, dessen *πνεῦμα* im Mysterion Wohnung nimmt."³ According to J. Weiss, there could be three possible sources of Paul's concept of the cosmic Lord in I Cor. 8 : 6 (cf. Rom. 8 : 34; Col. 1 : 15ff.): the Jewish Wisdom (Prov. 8 : 30, etc.), the Spirit (Wisdom of Solomon 7 : 22ff., etc.), or the Logos-concept of Philo. Paul's marked use of prepositions appears Philonic, but especially Col. 1 : 15ff. seems to be indebted to Philo's *κόσμος νοητός* or *ἰδέα ἰδεῶν*.⁴ Käsemann suggests, with reference to J. Weiss' theory that in I Cor. 8 : 6 the pre-existent Christ partakes in the creation of the world, that I Cor. 8 : 5-6 interprets Christ as the one true man in contrast to the plurality of original men in Gnosticism:

¹ Heinrich Weinel, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), p. 527, etc.: J. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (1910), p. 226.

² Eduard Norden, *Agnostos Theos (Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede)* (Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), p. 241; cf. pp. 253, 347.

³ Hans Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I-II*² (HNT, IX; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923), p. 37.

⁴ Johannes Weiss, *op. cit.*, p. 226.

Dies noch weiterführend lässt sich vielleicht behaupten, dass die vielen Kyrioi, die dem Christus gegenüberstehen, die zahlreichen Urmenschen der Gnosis sind, denen der Christus als der wahre Anthropos entgegengestellt ist.¹

Bultmann claims that I Cor. 8 : 6 is indebted to Logos and Wisdom speculation in Hellenistic Judaism which very early penetrated into Hellenistic Christianity, but that Rom. 11 : 36, I Cor. 8 : 6, Heb. 2 : 10, Eph. 4 : 6 are also direct "Hellenistic (Stoic) formulations."²

This variety of postulates raises the question what kind of Hellenistic influence might be evident at Corinth, if a definite type can be found, or were there alternatives to Stoicism, the Mysteries, and Gnosticism? Another alternative would be that the opponents of Paul everywhere were Gnostics, but representing varying tendencies, some more Jewish and some more Hellenistic.³ Accordingly, the Corinthian γῶσις may have been a Jewish type. The admission that there may have been some embryonic gnostic influence in the Corinthian Church,⁴ and possibly in the specific formula expressed in I Cor. 8 : 6, does not preclude that this incipient Gnosticism was predominantly Jewish in origin and content at the time of Paul.⁵ Walter Schmithals contends that Paul's opponents in Corinth and elsewhere were Jewish-Christian Gnostics, who were independent of the Jerusalem apostolate and whose cosmic dualism and pessimistic view of this world were at least as much indebted to Judaism as to Gnosticism. Since Paul assumes that his Christology and that

¹ Ernst Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (BHT, IX; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933), p. 164.

² Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I (London: SCM, 1952), 132, 70-71.

³ H. Köster, "Häretiker im Urchristentum," *RGG*³, III (1958), cols. 17-21.

⁴ R. M. Grant, *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1963), pp. 204-07.

⁵ W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1925), p. 311, argues that because of the use of Rabbinic methods in I Cor. there must have been a considerable Jewish element in the church at Corinth. Later, Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1939), pp. 193-94, thinks that any Hellenistic influence which may have been present in the Corinthian Church and Corinthian correspondence with Paul probably came through Judaism, for "the language of I Cor. 8 : 6-7 has suggested the adoption of the widespread literary convention of Hellenistic-Jewish literature, which saw in the unity of the Torah, people and Temple a symbol of the unity of God." Cf. further the criticism of Reitzenstein's three major books for over-estimating the influence of "Hellenistic" conceptions on Paul's thought, as is argued by Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, pp. 136-49.

of the Corinthians is the same (I Cor. 15 : 1-5), however, Schmithals' further notion that the Corinthians had a well developed gnostic scheme of mythology and Christology in distinction from Paul's Christology is not sustained.¹

It is also possible that Paul speaks as he does in I Cor. 8 : 6 not because his confrontation at Corinth with the Hellenistic type of Gnosticism first suggested to him such modes of expression, but rather because late Judaism and Wisdom literature had already suggested this manner of thinking to the early Church before Paul. The following discussion of the contrasts between Hellenistic Gnosticism and Judaism concerning the concepts in I Cor. 8 : 6 and its immediate context suggests that this latter conclusion is correct. It is another question, however, whether the reason that Paul developed a sapientially oriented Christology, which Feuillet sees in Col. 1 : 15-20 but also earlier in I-II Cor., was to capitalize on Hellenistic fascination with wisdom, for "wisdom" is notably lacking in I-II Thess. which also were addressed to Hellenistic Christians.²

1. It has been seen that Jesus' lordship is expressed here not in a philosophical manner but in terms of "practical monotheism." Paul's understanding of lordship is not amenable in this respect to gnostic interpretation, as E. Schweizer has rightly observed, but it does not necessarily follow that Paul spoke of lordship over the powers only to convey an existential as opposed to a cosmic meaning.³ Not all cosmic meaning is gnostic, as Jewish monotheism attests, if by

¹ Hans Conzelmann, "Current Problems in Pauline Research," *Interp*, XXII (1968), 185 n. 27. Cf. W. Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*² (FRLANT, LXVI; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965); E. Dinkler, "Korintherbriefe," *RGK*, IV (1960), cols. 17-23; W. G. Kümmel (ed.), *Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon, 1966), pp. 200-202.

² André Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (*Études Bibliques*; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), p. 79, etc., and review of same by David Stanley, S.J. in *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 254-56. The influence of Wisdom on Paul's thought has also been emphasized by: Sanday and Headlam, *The Epistle to the Romans* (ICC; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896), pp. 51-52, 267-69; Hegemann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler*, pp. 110ff., 133ff.; E. Schweizer, *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 105ff.; H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*, 12 (1966), 231-44.

³ Eduard Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², pp. 87-112, especially pp. 109-12. Cf. Rom. 5 : 19; 8 : 38f.; 10 : 9; 14 : 9; I Cor. 2 : 2; 12 : 3; 15 : 3, 25f.; Gal. 4 : 3, 8-10, 13; Col. 2 : 15. Though Schweizer proposes an unnecessary antithesis between "physical terminology" and existential meaning in Paul's proclamation that "the powers are dead" (*Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², pp. 11-12), he also describes the dangers of an abstract doctrine of Christ "für uns" without reference to our being "mit ihm" (*ibid.*, pp. 183-84).

"monotheism" we mean "emphasis upon the most characteristic and unique feature of Israel: the exclusive exaltation of the one source of all power, authority, and creativity."¹ The confession of faith to which Paul appeals here is explicable on the basis of a faith which had originally been stated in Jewish terms.²

2. It has also been held that Christian gnosis is for Paul primarily ethical in quality, for its main purpose is practical application or edification.³ While the Corinthians had not grasped the implication for a particular ethical problem of Jesus' lordship, as asserted in the confession of faith, they had many other problems of conduct and thought which appear to be rooted in no single source, whether Gentile Hellenistic, Hellenistic Jewish, or other influence.⁴

The contention that the Corinthian "heresy," with its emphasis on knowledge, was purely Hellenistic (Reitzenstein, Bousset, Bultmann, Käsemann, etc.), especially a form of Hellenistic mysticism, is countered by considerable evidence to the contrary including: parallels between the concept of "mystery" in I Cor. 2:6-16 and in the DSS; the ethical passion, eschatological character, societary emphasis, and the connection with the Law which characterize knowledge (*da'ath*) in the DSS, unlike the meaning of gnosis in gnostic circles or Hellenistic mysteries; and the presence in first-century and earlier Judaism of mystical groups who had a gnosis.⁵ Further, Rom. 11:33 indicates that Paul's use of the word σοφία depended on the tradition, and the latter may well have depended on the connection between σοφία and γνῶσις which was made in Wisdom literature (Prov. 8:12; 21:11; Eccl. 1:16f.).⁶

¹ G. E. Wright, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (SBT, 2; London: SCM, 1950), p. 39; cf. p. 41.

² Dupont, *Gnosis*, pp. 346-47; cf. I Thess. 1:9; Gal. 4:8.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 373, 377; *supra* p. 65, n. 3.

⁴ Peter Lengsfeld, *Adam und Christus* (Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag, 1965), p. 64, lists the practical problems.

⁵ W. D. Davies, *Christian Origins and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), pp. 127ff., 140, 172; Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*² (London: SPCK, 1955), pp. 14f. Cf. W. Bousset, *Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*² (FRLANT, IV; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921); E. Käsemann, "Die Legitimität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu II Kor. 10-13," *ZNW*, XLI (1942), 33-71; R. Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*³ (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927).

⁶ Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*, 12 (1966), 235. Heinz Schwantes, *Schöpfung der Endzeit (Arbeiten zur Theologie, XII)* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963), maintains on the other hand that cre-

On the other hand, one does not see in I Cor. an anti-Jewish polemic, as Dupont, Schoeps, and others have claimed. Absence of qualifying adjectives for γνῶσις in Rom. 2 : 20, Col. 2 : 3, and I Tim. 6 : 20 does not amount to polemic against Jewish gnosis.¹ Paul's concern was with the whole congregation (I Cor. 3 : 1-4), including all its factions.

3. The pre-existence of Jesus, which is implied in his mediatorship in creation, is a concept with ample Hebraic roots, particularly in the concept of "wisdom."² E. Schweizer has emphasized this concerning later Pauline statements of pre-existence.

The spatial categories with which Paul developed the implications of Christ's pre-existence, especially in Phil. 2 : 6-11 (in contrast to I Cor. 15 : 3-5) "have their pre-history already in late Judaism."³ Paul's description of Jesus' work in terms of the humiliation of the pre-existent Son of God and his exaltation to be Lord over the Church and over the powers tries to guard against the danger, which later appeared in Christian Gnosticism, of understanding "das Heilsgeschehen als einen Prozess..., der das Schicksal des Kosmos physisch bestimmt" or, on the other hand, of understanding "das Heilsgeschehen als rein vorbildliches Handeln," which would make of the whole Christ-event "nur Darstellung eines für jeden Menschen geltenden Gesetzes."⁴

But contrary to Schweizer's judgment, pre-existence did not enter Pauline thought only at Col. 1, for it was present at least from I Cor. 8 : 6. As Hegermann has argued, there was a Christology of Christ as Mediator of creation already in Palestinian kerygma.⁵

ation-theology was foundational for Late Judaism, but that Paul's use of the Stoic "All-formula" transformed it into only ethical meaning (25). Further, Paul did not use titles for God as Creator which were familiar to Late Judaism (Maccabees, Philo, Wisd., etc.), nor did he use their familiar verbs for creation (9). Needless to say, this evidence is not decisive, for concepts are expressible in many different words.

¹ Dupont, *Gnosis*, p. 256; H. J. Schoeps, *Paul, the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History* (London: Lutterworth, 1961), p. 78; Kümmel, *Introduction*, p. 202.

² E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*, pp. 100-101; cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* II, 86 concerning I Cor. 10 : 4. But Schweizer supposes that Phil. 2 : 6-8 refers to Jesus' earthly life.

³ *Erniedrigung*, p. 179. Cf. H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch* (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926), III, 700ff.; I, 334f., 346ff., 430, 743f.

⁴ *Erniedrigung*, pp. 114-15.

⁵ Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 135, who demonstrated influence of the Hellenistic

It is concluded that these three important concepts of I Cor. 8 : 6 and its context are rooted primarily in the soil of late Judaism and Wisdom literature rather than of Gentile Hellenism. Evidence has been: (1) the many fundamental contrasts which have been observed between Gnostics or Hellenistic mysteries and Judaism concerning these concepts; (2) the difficulties, accordingly, of agreeing with those scholars who have asserted the Gentile Hellenistic background of I Cor. 8 : 6; and (3) the many important parallels between Paul and Judaism in the content of these concepts.

E) This conclusion means that the problem of the relation between creation and redemption probably was not deferred until contact with Gentile Hellenistic concepts rendered imperative a specifically Christian dealing with that issue. There was ample dynamic in the confrontation between Judaism and Christianity and there was the inner necessity for Paul of thinking through what it meant to know Jesus as Lord. The development of cosmic Christology, which appears at an early stage here, does not need to be explained by reference to external stimulus.

The lordship of Christ over creation and redemption is nowhere expressed more concisely, and scarcely more precisely, than in I Cor. 8 : 6, which represents an early stage in Paul's mission work. Here it is made clear that Christ's lordship over creation does not depend on his lordship in redemption, nor does the latter depend on the former, for the one Lord exercises his lordship over both creation and redemption. The theological thinking which is expressed in this confession of faith does not move only from creation to redemption nor only from redemption to creation, the effect of the first movement being to make redemption an appendix to the work of creation and the effect of the second movement being to subordinate creation to redemption, but rather this theological thinking moves from God, who is the Source and Goal of creation and redemption, and from

synagogue on development of Hellenistic Christianity, maintains that Paul combatted erroneous cosmic speculations in Colossae by referring to the old confession of faith of which I Cor. 8 : 6 is a witness (169). Conzelmann, *I Kor.* (1969), p. 172 n. 49: "Die religionsgeschichtlichen Voraussetzungen sind z.T. in der jüdischen Spekulation über die σοφία und den λόγος zu fassen." Cf. Prov. 3 : 19; 8 : 22ff.; Wisd. 7 : 22ff. and 8 : 15; Sir. 24 : 3ff.; Philo, *Leg. All.* II, 49 f. F. B. Craddock, *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament* (New York: Abingdon, 1968), pp. 91-93, mistakenly concludes that the confession of I Cor. 8 : 6, based on a Stoic formula, was framed on an Hellenistic cyclic view of time.

the Kyrios, Jesus Christ, who is Mediator of creation and redemption, toward both creation and redemption.

II. PHILIPPIANS 2 : 6-11*

The difficulties of this text are legion and an enormous amount of scholarly work continues to be devoted to it. Along with the indispensable *Forschungsbericht* which has been provided by Ralph P. Martin, a number of important articles have been published since 1965 when his study was given its first form.¹

Linguistic, stylistic and contextual evidences together make clear that these verses comprise a separate literary piece within Paul's letter to the Philippians, that they were not written *ad hoc* but were rather cited by Paul, and that they contain pre-Pauline Christology which Paul affirms and elaborates.² It will be maintained here that this hymn is useful for the objective of this study because it de-

* Portions of this section appeared in *NT*, XIII (1970) and appreciation is expressed to the editors for permission to use that material here.

¹ Ralph P. Martin, *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTMS, 4; Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1967). Cf. Joachim Gnilka, *Der Philipperbrief* (HTKNT, X 3; Freiburg: Herder, 1968); Reinhard Deichgräber, *Gottes-hymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (SUNT, V; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967).

Articles: Norman K. Bakken, "The New Humanity: Christ and the Modern Age," *Interp*, XXII (1968), 71-82; A. Feuillet, "L'Hymne Christologique de l'Épître aux Philippiens (II, 6-11)," *RB*, LXXII (1965), 248-74, 481-507; J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 178-82; D. Georgi, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil. 2, 6-11," in E. Dinkler (ed.), *Zeit und Geschichte* (Tübingen, 1964); John Harvey, "A New Look at the Christ Hymn in Philippians 2 : 6-11," *ET*, LXXVI (1965), 337-39; Robert Jewett, "The Epistolary Thanksgiving and the Integrity of Philippians," *NT*, XII (1970), 40-53; Richard N. Longenecker, "Some Distinctive Early Christological Motifs," *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 526-45; T. E. Pollard, "The Integrity of Philippians," *NTSt*, 13 (1966), 57-66; D. W. B. Robinson, "ἀρπαγμός: The Deliverance Jesus Refused?," *ET*, LXXX (1969), 253-54; J. A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2 : 1-11," *JBL*, LXXXVIII (1969), 279-90; Georg Strecker, "Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus Phil 2 : 6-11," *ZNW*, 55 (1964), 63-78; Charles H. Talbert, "The Problem of Pre-existence in Philippians 2 : 6-11," *JBL*, LXXXVI (1967), 141-53; Paul Trudinger, "ἀρπαγμός and the Christological Significance of the Ascension," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 279; David H. Wallace, "A Note on morphé," *TZ*, 22 (1966), 19-25.

² Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 42-45; cf. discussion of history of research in Gnilka, *Der Philipperbrief*, pp. 131-47.

scribes Christ in relation to the world, rather than in relation to the Father, and emphasizes the dynamic work of the Lord in his history of pre-existence, humiliation and exaltation. This functional basis carries important ontological implications.¹

It is less the cosmological terms in Phil. 2 : 10 which render the hymn important for the theme of creation and redemption than Paul's paraenetic purpose in his use of the hymn, and more especially the Christology itself.

A) Probably the terms ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων refer to the cosmic totality's dynamism or power.² Unlike Col. 2 : 15, there is no mention here of a cosmic conflict whereby the principalities and powers were disarmed, but the usually hostile spirit-powers are likely designated by these three terms, and they, as world-rulers, perform their duty of publicly admitting Christ's lordship over them.³

The fifth century commentator Theodoret has been cited in favor of the meaning "heavenly spirits," and Ignatius' Letter to the Trallians 9 is an instance of the division of all beings into three regions.⁴ Arndt and Gingrich refer to the Paris Magical Papyrus,

¹ E.g., Wallace, *op. cit.*, who is in partial agreement with Lightfoot as opposed to O. Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

² On the other hand, according to J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*¹⁰ (London: Macmillan & Co., 1890), p. 115, all three of these adjectives are neuter and universal in scope: "all creation, all things whatsoever and wheresoever they be" (cf. Polycarp's Letter to Phil. 2, Ignatius' Letter to Trallians 9, and Rom. 8 : 22, Eph. 1 : 20-22, Rev. 5 : 13).

R. P. Martin, *An Early Christian Confession: Philippians II. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation* (London: Tyndale Press, 1960), p. 36 (cf. p. 66, footnote 102), suggests, however, that these three adjectives make a personal reference, as does the Paris Magical Papyrus of c. A.D. 300, to "intelligent beings." Cf. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (New York: George H. Doran, 1927), p. 257; Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 255-65.

Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 290, maintain with reference to Ignatius' Letters to the Trallians 9 : 1 and to the Ephesians 13 : 2, "it is impossible to say with certainty from which nominative ἐπιγείων is derived, ἐπιγείων or ἐπιγεία."

³ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 261-62. E. Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2 : 5-11," *ZTK*, XLVII (1950), 313-60 [Eng. tr. in *JTC*, V (1968), 45-88], infers from the Col. texts that also in Phil. 2 : 10-11 Christ's dominion means conquest of angelic powers.

⁴ H. A. A. Kennedy, "The Epistle to the Philippians," in W. R. Nicoll (ed.), *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, III, 439. The source of Theodoret's comment is not given: ἐπουρανίους καλεῖ τὰς ἀοράτους δυνάμεις, ἐπιγείους δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ ζῶντι ἀνθρώπου καὶ καταχθονίους τοὺς τεθνεώτας.

line 1918, as evidence that *καταχθονίων* has been used to mean "beings or powers under the earth," and the same papyrus, lines 225f. and 3038ff., especially 3042f. as evidence that *ἐπιγείων* "is not confined to human beings." *Οἱ ἐπουράνια* means "heavenly beings," according to the evidence of Theocritus 25 : 5 (third century B.C.), which used the word as a designation of the gods, as well as according to other sources.¹ Though Ethelbert Stauffer interprets Phil. 2 : 10f. as referring to Christ's "demonic opponents," there is no suggestion in the context of a conflict.² (Cf. Is. 45 : 20-25, to which Phil. 2 : 10-11 refers and which speaks of "a righteous God and a Savior" who says: "Turn to me and be saved, all the ends of the earth.") Probably, then, the reference of Phil. 2 : 10f. is to the "cosmic powers" or "spirits," whether good or bad.³

Whatever nuance of meaning is preferred, the point of Phil. 2 : 10f. is obviously to proclaim the universality of Christ's lordship.⁴

¹ Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 290, 306, 421.

² Stauffer, *New Testament Theology* (New York: Macmillan, 1956), p. 130; cf. pp. 136, 217, 224. Ragnar Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror* (London: SPCK, 1954), maintains that "no mythical combat is hinted at in Phil. 2 : 9-11" (113), and: "Heaven, earth, and underworld embrace the total cosmos. It is out of place to ask who are referred to by each term, e.g., whether those 'under the earth' are the angels of death or the dead (cf. Rom. 14 : 9). A parallel is found in Rev. 5 : 13. The enthronement of the Lamb is accompanied by the adoration of 'every creature in heaven and on earth and under the earth and all therein' " (114). Such passages as Phil. 2 : 11, I Cor. 15 : 24ff., I Cor. 2 : 6-8, Col. 2 : 15, Rom. 8 : 38f. "...certainly illustrate in poetic language the complete triumph of Christ and the basis of a victorious life, but they give us no information as to the character of the cosmic powers. There is, then, in the authentic Pauline letters only one passage explicitly and directly dealing with Christ's victorious death as a conquest of cosmic powers, viz. Col. 2 : 15" (115).

³ Cf. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I (London: SCM Press, 1952), 125, 175-76, 299; II, 153; Cullmann, *Christology*, p. 223; Schlatter, *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, VIII (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1950), 76.

⁴ Neufeld, *op. cit.*, p. 60 observes that Paul enlarged and enriched the conception of Jesus as the exalted Lord: "As has been noted, Paul received the concept of the risen and exalted Lord from the primitive church, although it must have been confirmed by his own experience. He also received his basic eschatological ideas from the primitive church. But with Paul the understanding of the role of the ascended Lord is enlarged and enriched. The implication of the exaltation is expanded so that the Jesus whom God made Lord becomes the Lord of all, the only Lord, before whom every knee shall bow. From this firm conviction Paul's thought moves into the past (the pre-existent Lord) and into the future (the coming Lord)."

Werner Kramer, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn, Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vor-*

It has been debated when that lordship is in effect, whether the universal homage is delayed until the Parousia or is a present fact since the ascension. The problem remains whether ἐξομολογῆσεται is read or ἐξομολογήσεται. The enthronement scene pictured here brings to mind, however, the universal adoration of the Lamb in Rev. 5 : 1-14. In both texts the *apokatastasis* (cf. Acts 3 : 21; Rom. 11 : 32; I Cor. 15 : 27-8; Eph. 1 : 10; Col. 1 : 20) occurs within the presence of God for whom there is no past, present or future, and in whose sight that occurrence is accomplished. Lohmeyer rightly emphasizes the cosmic dimension, but he does not have to put out of mind Jesus' lordship also over the Church. In the words of Ralph Martin:

The Christ-hymn enables the Church to see beyond the present in which the Head of the Church reigns invisibly and powerfully—but known only to faith—to that full proof of His reign in the heavenly sphere in which all the powers are veritably subject to Him and His dominion is manifestly confessed.¹

The exaltation of Jesus to lordship (2 : 9ff.) is for the purpose that creation should be returned to the service which that lordship (in the form of a servant and in human form) performs "to the glory of God the Father." The cosmic power is at the service of the Father's glory through the lordship of Jesus Christ. In this respect, the final redemption of creation, which was purposed before creation (2 : 6, and implied in Eph. 1 : 9-10), is a result of Jesus' reconciling work.

B) The practical purpose to which this hymn is put by Paul suggests, as do other factors, that new insight into the cosmic meaning of God's redemptive work in Jesus was gained by starting with

paulinischen Gemeinden (ATANT, XLIV; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), p. 38 n. 85, maintains that Phil. 2 : 9-11 does what Acts 2 : 36, Rom. 1 : 4, and possibly Acts 13 : 33 do, namely expound the significance of the resurrection for Jesus. "Die Aussage der Pistisformel, die das nackte 'Dass' der Auferweckung festhält, muss gegenüber all den andern Wendungen als ursprünglicher gelten. Gerade diese Überlegungen sprechen für Ursprünglichkeit des Jesus-Namens in der Auferweckungsaussage, wie sie in die Pistisformel gekommen ist. Sie sagt: 'Jesus wurde auferweckt!', während die übrigen Wendungen erklären, dass diese Auferweckung aus Jesus einen besonderen Wurdenträger machte."

Cf. the discussion by Schmauch, *Beiheft*, pp. 29-30.

¹ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, p. 270; cf. pp. 266-70. Cf. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*⁸ (K-EKNT, IX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930), p. 97.

what was commonly agreed upon in the earliest Church's *homologia*, "Jesus is the Christ."¹ Certainly the hymn serves no esoteric speculative purpose in its context. Clearly Paul did not begin in this letter with cosmic or metaphysical speculations which then were loosely related to Jesus of Nazareth.

Rather, the cosmic role of Christ is described within the hymn in functional terms, and the entire hymn, including its cosmic Christology, serves an immediate, tangible need. The specific need of the Philippians to look after others in unity and service (2:4) and thereby allow God's work in them to enable them to work out their own salvation (2:12-13), is a need which brings to mind "the form of a servant" who was also "in the form of God," and who is described in the Christological hymn as one whose humiliation results, through God's grace (ἐχρηρίσαστο), in exaltation and in cosmic confession of his lordship. Even if it could be proved that Paul did not at some earlier time write this hymn and only quoted it in the Philippian letter, the important point is that this hymn and its cosmic implications are used within its context, without *imitatio Christi* being implied, to meet a particular ethical need.² Bo Reicke, who stresses the unity of the hymn with its context point for point,

¹ Vernon H. Neufeld, *op. cit.*, provides a comprehensive study of the *homologia* in the primitive Church, and corrects (p. 43, etc.) the thesis that "Christ is Lord" was the simplest formula in the *corpus Paulinum*, the latter view having been defended by Oscar Cullmann, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (London: Lutterworth, 1949), p. 58; cf. Cullmann, *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957), pp. 209-41.

According to Neufeld, *op. cit.*, p. 43, the simplest Pauline formula was "Jesus is Lord," which depended in turn on the earliest form of the *homologia*, namely "Jesus is the Christ" (p. 142). "Historically and logically the question of Jesus' messiahship preceded the question of his lordship or his sonship" (142).

Application of the LXX title κύριος to Jesus came relatively late, in the Hellenistic Church, and marks "den Endpunkt, nicht der Aufgangspunkt der Geschichte des Kyriostitels innerhalb der christlichen Gemeinde," according to Werner Kramer, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), p. 156.

² J. A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities," p. 289, vigorously yanks "one more prop ... from under those who still would find models for morality in the Bible," and underlines "the integrity of vss. 1-11 as Paul penned them" (290). Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 189-96, on the other hand, describes the hymn as a "Paradigma der Demut und der Selbstpreisgabe."

Rom. 5:12ff., Rom. 8:19ff., I Cor. 8:6, Phil. 2:6ff., Col. 1:15ff., Eph. 1:3ff. all give the distinct impression that as separate occasions arose, which presented particular needs, further implications of cosmic Christology were clarified and applied in concrete situations.

rightly maintains: "Les affirmations christologiques de celui-ci sont destinées à être appliquées directement à l'église locale de Philippies."¹

The context within which this hymn comes to us indicates, accordingly, that the early Church's understanding of the relation between creation and redemption need not have been a late development, but rather that the relation between creation and redemption was from the beginning implied in the messiahship of Jesus and is an integral part of God's self-revelation in Jesus Christ.² The cosmic work of Christ is not an *addendum*, once necessary but now dispensable, which is separable from a supposed "essence" of the gospel concerning Church life and justification of the individual.³

Further subsidiary evidence concerning Paul's use of the hymn is available if it can be proved that three phrases were added by Paul to the original hymn, namely: θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ, ἐπουρανίων καὶ ἐπιγείων καὶ καταχθονίων, and εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ πατρὸς. The first alleged addition would indicate the extent of Christ's identification with men, for crucifixion was considered especially despicable in a Roman city such as Philippi (Acts 16 : 12), and to the Jew it meant being put outside the covenant of Israel with God (Deut. 21 : 23), the latter being Paul's emphasis (Gal. 3 : 13; 5 : 11; 6 : 11ff.; I Cor. 1-2). Martin rightly argues that the phrase had particular "social and cultural relevance" to those in Philippi.⁴ On the other hand,

¹ Bo Reicke, "Unité chrétienne et diaconie, Phil. ii 1-11," in W. C. van Unnik *et al.* (eds.), *Neotestamentica et Patristica* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 212; cf. in agreement P. A. van Stempvoort, "De betekenis van Filippenzen 2 : 5 t/m 11," *Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift*, XIX (1964), 97-111. Failure to see this unity marks the work of Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2 : 5-11," *ZTK*, XLIII (1950), 313-60.

Paul is not contending, however, for an *imitatio Christi*. Cf. Georg Eichholz, "Bewahren und Bewähren des Evangeliums: der Leitfaden von Philipper 1-2," in Helmut Gollwitzer and H. Traub (eds.), *Hören und Handeln, Festschrift für Ernst Wolf zum 60. Geburtstag* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962), p. 99; Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 71-74, 84-88, 288.

² According to E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², pp. 100-101, the Christology of this hymn is indebted to Jewish sources rather than to a gnostic redeemer-myth. The circumstance that such concepts as the "form of God" and "equality with God" were primary causes of the gospel being "a stumbling-block to Jews" (I Cor. 1 : 23) did not prevent the early Jewish-Christian church from asserting that "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2 : 36).

³ Käsemann, "Kritische Analyse," pp. 313ff. mistakenly contends that the paraenetic context of this hymn shows that there is no concern for the creation here, but only for soteriology.

⁴ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, p. 221 n. 3.

since the three-fold division of the universe is nowhere else used by Paul, and since the third alleged addition expresses not only Pauline thought (Rom. 15 : 6f.; II Cor. 4 : 15; Phil. 1 : 11) but also general early Christian thought, it does not appear necessary to attribute these phrases to Pauline addition.¹

These three phrases, in any case, in no way compromise the major emphasis of the hymn on the drama of Christ's being raised to Lordship by God. As Martin has said: "The centre of gravity of this *carmen Christi* is the proclamation of Christ's lordship over all cosmic forces."² If there was a tendency to nihilism and purposeless existence in the Hellenistic *milieu* at Philippi, and if for such a reason the nerve of ethical action had been cut in the Philippian congregation, the message of this hymn that "God in Christ is in control of the universe and that life has meaning" was particularly well suited to the Philippians' needs.³ If the truth of Christ's cosmic work had been elaborated only in order to meet those needs, however, in the fashion of problem-centered preaching, Paul's message would have carried no convincing weight. His appeal to previously held Christian affirmation did.

C) With the exception of the cosmological terms previously discussed, the key concepts of the hymn are christological. It is to their import for the relation between creation and redemption that we now turn.

1. Ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ. There are two sections in the hymn and this phrase introduces the first of them. 2 : 6ff. describes God's movement toward the creation and 2 : 9ff. describes the creation's movement toward God. The first four concepts to be considered here describe the approach of the redemptive purpose toward the creation.

Two related problems concerning the term *μορφῇ* have to be dealt with, namely the meaning of the term and the question whether pre-existence is implied. Rather than reading the usage of classical Greek into the term, it seems preferable to interpret it in the light of Old Testament usage, a theory which capitalizes on Lohmeyer's suggestion that the author's mother-tongue was Semitic.⁴ D. H.

¹ Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 125-26.

² Martin, *Carmen Christi*, p. viii.

³ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, p. 302. Cf. Craddock, *Pre-existence*, pp. 107-12.

⁴ Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus : eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2 : 5-11* (Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1928), pp. 62-67; cf. pp. 7, 9, 13.

Wallace, who rightly maintains that *μορφή* and *εἰκὼν* do not mean exactly the same thing and who asserts that "the plainest sense of *μορφή* indicates something of a metaphysical characteristic," also interprets the Christ-hymn (*pace* Lightfoot) against a primarily Hebraic background, maintains that the hymn "is a compound of several O.T. motifs which include the ideas of Adam, Son of man and Servant of the Lord," and admits that "*μορφή* and *εἰκὼν* at times may overlap in their semantic value, so that one seems to reduplicate the thought of the other in a given context."¹ Moreover, Wallace does not discuss *temunah* which is translated in the LXX by both *εἰκὼν* and *δόξα* (Nu. 12 : 8; Job 4 : 16; Ps. 17 : 15), nor does he refer to the important discussion by Jacob Jervell of "*die Offenbarungsqualität Christi*" according to II Cor. 4 : 4-6 (cf. Col. 1 : 15 and possibly I Cor. 11 : 7, Col. 3 : 10).² While acknowledging a difference in emphasis between *μορφή* and *εἰκὼν*, it is concluded that *μορφή* θεοῦ in Phil. 2 : 6 corresponds to the pre-existent glory of Jn. 17 : 5.³

A number of arguments have been raised, however, against the thesis that this phrase implies the pre-existence of Christ. Georg Strecker emphasizes links between the hymn and the paraenetic context, maintains that Paul transformed the original hymn to make it refer to the obedience of the Crucified and to present salvation (with obvious ethical implications for the Philippians), and argues against Jeremias' description of "the three states of Christ's existence" in the hymn because pre-existence serves no paraenetic purpose and barely is mentioned in the participial phrase.⁴ John Harvey, who mentions modern "embarrassment" with the concept of pre-existence as reason for seeking an alternative interpretation (!), maintains that Jesus as "the New and the Ultimate Man" (Gen.

¹ D. H. Wallace, "A Note on *Morphé*," *TZ*, 22 (1966), 19-25. Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, p. 89, maintains that "the subtlety of the allusions in this passage defies positive identification," and makes the methodological point that if the hymn is pre-Pauline "reasoning from what Paul says elsewhere to this passage is not without its difficulties" (90).

² Jacob Jervell, *Imago Dei* (*FRLANT*, 76; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), pp. 214-18. Cf. L. H. Brockington, "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of *δόξα*," in D. E. Nineham (ed.), *Studies in the Gospels* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1955), p. 2.

³ So contends J. Behm, "*μορφή*," in *TWNT*, IV, 759. Cf. R. P. Martin, *An Early Christian Confession*, p. 47 n. 9. My article in *NT*, XIII (1970) was written before reading Wallace's article.

⁴ Strecker, *op. cit.*, also deletes 2 : 8 as a gloss.

1-3) had the "divine nature from the first" in the same sense that Adam did, who was made in the image of God.¹ Charles H. Talbert presupposes that "parallel structure points to parallel meanings," uses the principle that "a proper delineation of *form* leads to a correct interpretation of *meaning*," compares the first two strophes, and concludes that the hymn "means to speak only of the human existence of Jesus."² Norman K. Bakken, who is enamoured of the notion that "man has come of age" (attributed by him to Bonhoeffer, Vahanian, Hamilton, Van Buren, Altizer), agrees with Harvey Cox that transcendence is accessible only "in a human life in human history," accuses Cullmann of "importing the notion of the pre-existence of Jesus, the divine heavenly man," and asserts that Phil. 2 : 6-11 is "a reaffirmation of the secular and temporal role, the flesh-and-blood existence, of man, the man whom God intended."³

The discomfort of Strecker, Harvey and Bakken with the concept of pre-existence is evident, but their arguments against presence of the concept in the hymn are not persuasive. Strecker cannot deny that the phrase ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ was in the original hymn. Harvey's approach depends on finding reference to a Last Adam in this phrase, but Scroggs, who is much impressed with Paul's preoccupation with Gen. 1-3, is very cautious about asserting the Adamic background of this hymn and remarks that "the subtlety of the allusions in this passage defies positive identification," so that: "To say more than that an Adamic allusion possibly *may* be found in Philippians 2 is unwarranted."⁴ Bakken maintains that "have this mind among yourselves" did not mean that they were "to empty themselves of divine prerogative, of the being of God," and thus pre-existence was not intended. But Paul does not use the hymn to enjoin *imitationem Christi*. Further, why would the concept of pre-existence exclude the "reaffirmation" of which he speaks?

¹ Harvey, *op. cit.* Cf. Craddock, *Pre-existence*, pp. 108-09, who rightly objects to Harvey's "too utilitarian" approach.

² Talbert, *op. cit.*, p. 141, n. 2, enumerates objections to pre-existence. However, if μορφῇ in Phil. 2 : 6 refers to the divine glory, the idea of epiphany is present here also.

³ Bakken, *op. cit.*

⁴ Scroggs, *The Last Adam*, pp. 89-90; cf. pp. 99, 115 n. 2. J. A. Sanders, "Dissenting Deities," p. 281: "It would seem to me at this juncture of the study of the Philippian hymn that what is needed are attempts to bring together the apparently disparate aspects of the hymn: its semitic literary features and its hellenistic mythic features."

Talbert's basic principle is open to question, according to J. A. Sanders, who rightly contends that "form must always be evaluated *ad hoc* in the light of content and context."¹

In addition to difficulties with arguments against the presence of pre-existence in the thought of this hymn, several other observations are in order. It is notable that Heinz Tödt, who is intent to stress "the absence of the elements of pre-existence and exaltation in the Synoptic sayings concerning the Son of Man," does not deny the presence of this theme in Phil. 2 : 6ff.² It needs be emphasized again that the hymn is not used by Paul to encourage his readers to reproduce in sequence events in Christ's life, and to argue otherwise runs the risk of formulating an ethic of humility "as a strategy for attaining exaltation."³ Certainly the pre-existence which is only mentioned here (as Strecker says) is not developed as in Col. 1 : 15ff., so that "Phil. ii. 6 depicts the very earliest beginnings of that Christian cosmic Christology which came to full maturity in the later literature."⁴ (Cf. also Rom. 10 : 6-9; I Cor. 8 : 6; II Cor. 8 : 9; Heb. 1 : 2ff.)⁵ While "the form of God" and "the form of a slave" are both mentioned, the relation between them is not established, thereby indicating that the hymn's emphasis is on the work of Christ.

Being "in the form of God," accordingly, Jesus makes God manifest in this world, for the pre-existent "glory" did enter the world in decisive acts (ἡγήσατο, ἐκένωσεν, ἐταπείνωσεν). Without necessarily relying on the Adamic speculation, the author of this hymn could nonetheless mean at the same time that Jesus, in so doing,

¹ Sanders, *op. cit.*, p. 281 n. 12. Cf. Craddock, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

² H. E. Tödt, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965), pp. 178, 220, 295.

³ Craddock, *op. cit.*, p. 109, who also observes that Altizer's "radicality" consists of a literalism concerning kenosis so that Jesus' transcendence is fully transformed into immanence (181). Cf. E. Schweizer, *Lordship and Discipleship* (1960), p. 99; F. W. Beare, *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Philippians* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Bros., 1959), p. 75.

⁴ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, p. 318, arguing against R. H. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (1965), who places this "three stage" Christology at a later time than early Hellenistic Jewish Christianity. Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (1969), p. 201, speaks clearly about the meaning of pre-existence: "It is not a possibility immanent in the world, but breaks in from outside and thus remains God's salvation. Pre-existence thus means that salvation is founded on God's miraculous act; the word means the actualization of the prevenient salvation event and thus describes the objective priority of God's act to my faith."

⁵ James M. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus* (SBT, 25; London: SCM, 1959), p. 52, finds "pre-existence-humiliation-exaltation" pattern here.

fulfilled man's destiny, which was to glorify God, as Paul often asserted (Phil. 3 : 21 and I Cor. 15 : 49; II Cor. 3 : 18; Rom. 5 : 12-21; 8 : 29-30). According to the writer of this hymn, to look at Jesus is to see that it is the nature of God to be and to will to be together with his creation. God's redemptive purpose is not directed away from this world and the purpose of man's salvation is not to escape from this world. Accordingly, the work of redemption cannot be an appendix to the work of creation, nor is redemption implied in the creation.

2. Ἀρπαγμός. If the traditional alternatives alone are considered, it does not seem probable that *res rapienda* ("something to be seized") is to be preferred to the exclusion of *res rapta* ("something already seized"). The judgment of R. P. Martin is commendably balanced:

In short, His heavenly station, His 'being in the form of God' as the Image of the heavenly Man, is *res rapta*; but is given up when He comes to accept the station of a Man and a servant. The lordship which is implicit in His pre-existent state and waits to be exercised *de facto* over the world is the *res rapienda*; and the meaning of the verse is that He did not reach out from His favoured place and grasp at that authority. He chose, on the contrary, to be installed as World-Ruler and *Cosmocrat* at the completion of a mission of self-humbling and lowly obedience unto death.¹

Jesus in his humanity did not grasp at the sovereignty which by right was his in his existence eternally in the "form of God." Implicit here, even if not necessarily so in the preceding clause of 2 : 6, may be the contrast between the two Adams (though other allusions have been suggested, especially Satan),² for the first Adam did "snatch" after being "like God." Also implied is the Servant of God motif.

L. L. Hammerlich has recently proposed another possibility, however, namely that Ἀρπαγμός means "the being caught up/away = rapture," and that this meaning is "typically Pauline" (I Th. 4 : 17; II Cor. 12 : 2-4; and cf. Acts 8 : 39; Rev. 12 : 5)—in fact, Paul wrote the hymn. The meaning would be that, in contrast with Paul's temporary raptures after which he was taken down to earth again, Jesus' being with God was no rapture but was his nature.³ C. F. D.

¹ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 152-3.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 154-61. Cf. Furness, *op. cit.*

³ Cf. review of Hammerlich, *An Ancient Misunderstanding* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1966) in *ET*, LXXVIII (1967), 193-94.

Moule is reported to support the meaning *raptus* (act of snatching, acquisition), "the meaning of the passage being that Jesus' notion of deity was not a 'getting' but a 'giving' notion," and this meaning presupposes that "in the form of God" refers to Jesus' pre-existence.¹

It appears that whichever of these three theories is preferred the correlate of this clause comes with the statement in 2 : 9-11 that God confers lordship on Christ, and the consequence of any of these interpretations will be substantially the same for the relation between creation and redemption. That this Lord is the Servant in whom the glory of God shines, means that this lordship is not removed from history. In this world he "poured himself out" by being the Servant who was obedient to the extent of dying on the cross. Before all creation will participate in redemption (expressed in the metaphor "every knee shall bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth"), the history of reconciliation takes place proleptically within creation. It is a history which begins with the pre-incarnate Christ (2 : 6; cf. Eph. 1 : 4) and shows the identity in one Person of the "form of God" and the "form of a servant," that is, the unity of the redemptive purpose and the creature. The implication is repeated in this hymn that to be redeemed does not mean to forsake creation, for it is within and for creation that God's redemptive purpose is at work.

3. *Ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*. Who is the subject of the verb in this clause? If the subject is God, then the "humiliation" refers to the incarnation. If the subject is Jesus, on the other hand, the action of the verb refers to the death on the cross. Since there is a precedent for the latter interpretation in Is. 53 : 7, *הָעֶרְהָ ... נִפְשׁוֹ*, though there is no analogy in the Greek language for the use of *κενόω* with the reflexive, it seems most in accord with the evidence to say that Jesus is the subject of the verb and that the clause means: he abandoned himself to death ("er gab sich dem Tode preis").²

¹ D. W. B. Robinson, *op. cit.*, ET, LXXX (1969), p. 254 n. 1.

² Though, among others, G. Bornkamm, "Zum Verständnis des Christus-Hymnus Phil ii 6-11," *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, Gesammelte Aufsätze*², II (*Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie*, XXVIII; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963), 180, has contended against the interpretation of Phil. 2 : 7 in the light of Is. 53 : 7, the arguments of Joachim Jeremias, "Zu Phil ii 7: ΕΑΥΤΟΝ ΕΚΕΝΩΣΕΝ," *NT*, VI (1963), 182-8 and *XAPIS KAI SOΦIA, Festschrift Karl Heinrich Rengstorff* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), pp. 182-88, are convincing in favor of this interpretation. Jeremias' conclusion

What is the effect of this interpretation on the effort to find here a "kenotic Christology?" If Jesus is the subject of the verb, the clause speaks of the history of Jesus' actions and does not speak of the relation between two natures in the one person.¹ The circumstance that there is only one subject of this history carries, however, an important implication concerning the two natures, namely that this Jesus, whom the hymn designates as the pre-existent one, did not give himself over to death by ceasing to be who he is.² Though Jesus was exalted only subsequent to (δύο, 2 : 9) the kenosis, He is described by the hymn as the Messiah, as "Christ Jesus" (2 : 5) in the fulness of his humanity and self-abandonment. Is there any reason to think that Paul would disagree with the assertion of Mk. 1 : 11, namely that from the beginning of his public ministry Jesus was the Son of God ("Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased")? Though Jesus was "designated Son of God in power" at the resurrection (Rom. 1 : 4), he was the Son of God throughout his human life, having—as "Son"—been "descended from David according to the flesh" (Rom. 1 : 3). It is clear, accordingly, that Paul's emphasis on temporal sequence from the kenosis to the exaltation in Phil. 2 : 5–11 does not exclude thought concerning the person of Christ. Rather, it is precisely because Jesus worked as he did that God exalted him publicly in order that the cosmic totality might join in the acclamation of his lordship. It was through Jesus' work that God made him known as the one who is Lord.

Though several lines of evidence have been brought forth against kenotic Christology,³ and though prior forms of kenotic Christology

is based on two lines of evidence: linguistic, and the structure of the hymn. Favoring this interpretation are also Cullmann, *Christology*, p. 79, paragraph (4); C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952), p. 93; Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, pp. 43–44; J. A. T. Robinson, *The Body*, p. 14, footnote 1. *Contra* Cullmann, cf. Tödt, *op. cit.*, pp. 319ff. M. Black, "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," *BJRL*, XLV (1963), 305–18 sees the influence here of Wisdom 5 : 5 and the Jewish theme of vindication of the righteous.

¹ Donald G. Dawe, "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies," *SJT*, XV (1962), 341–42, who contends for some validity in the Kenotic Christology, admits that the "stimulus for the kenotic Christologies came from a desire to realign the orthodox conception of Christ as one person in two natures with a newly emerging conception of personality."

² This is acknowledged by Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, IV. 1 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956), 179f.

³ E. R. Fairweather, "Appended Note: The 'Kenotic' Christology," in F. W. Beare, *The Epistle to the Philippians* (HNTC; New York: Harper &

"failed to account properly for the reality of Christ's humanity,"¹ and though it is methodologically indefensible to develop a whole theology of kenosis from one clause in the hymn which is not an essay in Christology, yet the contribution of a kenotic Christology is that it does not allow a static conception of the being of God to obscure the dynamic movement of God in Christ, precisely the history, that is emphasized in this hymn.²

That God is mutable in the fulfillment of his immutable purpose of redemption is significant for the relation between creation and redemption,³ and it is this mutability, or capacity of God to change without destroying his absoluteness, which the kenotic Christology emphasizes. In the words of Dawe:

Kenosis is a metaphor that describes the complete freedom of God. ...The traditional doctrine of God actually limited God for in it God was only fully divine under the conditions of glory.

Bros., 1959), pp. 159-74, summarizes several lines of evidence against the validity of kenotic Christologies: (1) Modern exegetes, such as Marvin Vincent and F. W. Beare and Karl Barth, consider kenotic speculation as irrelevant to this text. (2) There is no kenotic interpretation in the Church's older exegetical tradition, but there is the assertion of God's immutability. (3) Two presuppositions inform kenotic speculation: the "monophysitism" of Lutheran Christology, and the tendency "to define personality in terms of the natural activity of consciousness." (4) Though the Kenoticists wished to remedy a supposed defect in Chalcedonian Christology, Chalcedon's ontological (rather than psychological) union of the Logos with a concrete human person (a union in person, not in nature) was an union which safeguarded the distinction of natures and allowed "as much room as in any Kenotic system for the recognition of the human reality of Jesus' temporal existence." (5) Barth's insistence that, by humbling himself, Jesus did not cease to be who he was and is.

¹ Dawe, *op. cit.*, p. 346.

² *Ibid.*, p. 347: "But the kenotic Christologies did initiate two lines of thought that have continued to shape Christian thought to this day. These have been the redefining of the absoluteness of God and rethinking the humanity of Jesus' mental and emotional life. ...Kenosis or self-emptying implies that God is capable of some sort of change. ...The divine impassibility does not consist in the absence of change, rather it means the ability to change in a manner that does not destroy the absoluteness of God. ...Thomasius' oft-repeated formula, 'Self-limitation is self-determination', summarised this idea." For a fuller statement, cf. Dawe, *The Form of a Servant* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963).

³ That God is mutable in the fulfillment of his immutable purpose of redemption is a major contention of Karl Barth, e.g., in *Church Dogmatics*, II. 1 (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957), 496.

...Kenosis reveals that there is a manward movement in the divine life. To become man is not something foreign to God. Kenosis says this in the most radical possible way. In Christ God did not become simply the sublime man, the hero; He became suffering and dying man.¹

If God's redemptive purpose brings him so far into the created order that One who is in the form of God dies on a cross, it is not to be doubted that God wills (ἐν α, 2 : 10) that creation participate in the fulfillment of that redemptive purpose which is consummated when God exalts the Servant to be "Lord Jesus Christ," and when this exaltation is answered by the affirming response of creation. The continuity in the history which leads from Jesus to Lord shows the continuity between God's purpose in creation and his purpose in redemption.

4. Μορφὴν δούλου λαβών. Against the complaint that Paul speaks of Christ only as taking the form of a servant, but not as being the servant,² it has been shown that Phil. 2 : 5ff. depends on Isaiah 52 : 13-53 : 12, and identifies the Messiah with the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.³ The history to which Phil. 2 : 5ff. bears witness makes an identification, speaks of a person Jesus, now known as "Christ" and "Lord."

The context suggests that Christ, who in essence is equal with God (2 : 6), took the form of the Servant, who was led away into death (Is. 53 : 8), but later would be "exalted and glorified exceedingly" (Is. 52 : 13). By seeing Jesus one sees that what God reveals through Jesus is the μορφή θεοῦ and μορφή δούλου. (Cf. a similar concept in John 14 : 9). The juxtaposition of these two terms in the hymn, as well as the use of participial clauses, implicitly shows that the person of Christ or the meaning of his incarnation is being revealed in the history of humiliation and exaltation.

This text shows, through its view of the incarnation, that the

¹ Dawe, "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies," pp. 348-49.

² Vincent Taylor, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching* (London: Epworth Press, 1940), pp. 95f.

³ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 274. Cf. *supra*, p. 84 n. 2; H. W. Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* (London: S.C.M., 1955), pp. 57, 104-05. E. Schweizer, "The Son of Man Again," *Neotestamentica*, 85-92, thinks that Jesus is usually interpreted, however, by the pattern of earthly life-exaltation-eschatology, which is attributed to the suffering righteous, as in Wisdom 2-4, because there are numerous hints in the gospels' passion stories to the psalms of the suffering righteous, but Is. 53 is almost lacking.

work of redemption is rooted in the act of creation, but is not a part of creation as if it belonged to creation. The importance of the incarnation for Paul's theology is shown partly in the deeper meaning of μορφή δουλοῦ which, as response to what God has done, represents the actual fulfillment within the creation of redemption.

The other description of the *kenosis*, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος, implies the same relation between creation and redemption. If the Docetic interpretation were correct, and the ὁμοίωμα meant merely an external similarity to man, then the incarnation would be no more than a temporary stage in the history of Christ, and redemption would have touched creation only tangentially. According to James Barr, however:

The whole sweep of the incarnational history up to its *telos* is best seen in Phil. 2 : 5-11, where the word ὁμοίωμα again appears. ...The Incarnation is thus a metamorphosis. The thought of pre-existence is fully implied. The exaltation after the Cross is not a re-metamorphosis into the original divine form; the Incarnation is thus not a temporary stage in the history of the Christ, for it is natural to assume, although and because it is not explicitly stated, that it is the form of man and the form of the servant that is now taken up into glory. Thus as we look forward from the Resurrection the theology of the flesh is still essential.¹

If the form of man and the form of the servant are taken up into glory, the implication is that God's redemptive purpose will not let creation go, but treasures it and holds it fast through Jesus the Lord, with the result that what was prophesied in Is. 45 : 23 is fulfilled. If the lordship of Christ were not so unchangeably and intimately bound up with the form of the servant, it would not be certain that the work of redemption aims to bring creation under that lordship.

5. Ἰνα...πᾶν γόνυ κάμψῃ...καὶ πᾶσα γλῶσσα ἐξομολογήσῃται ὅτι ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ. The use of the ὅτι *recitativum* shows that this acclamation is a primitive ὁμολογία, and the setting which is provided for it in the hymn (cf. 2 : 10) is liturgical. This primitive ὁμολογία was "Jesus is Lord."² The hymn envisions, accordingly, that the worship of the Lord which now takes place within the Church shall be extended to the furthest realm of Christ's lordship. This acclamation is entirely in accord with the practical monotheism

¹ James Barr, "The Word Became Flesh: The Incarnation in the New Testament," *Interp.*, X (1956), 22.

² Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, pp. 43, 61, etc.

of Christianity's Jewish antecedents, for Phil. 2 : 11 reflects (as does Rom. 14 : 11) Is. 45 : 23, just as I Cor. 8 : 6 applies to both God the Father and Jesus Christ the affirmation to which Deut. 6 : 4 gives expression.¹

There is a distinction expressed here between two realms of Christ's lordship, namely the Church and the cosmic totality. The statement in Phil. 2 : 10 that all creatures make the acclamation of Jesus' lordship is reminiscent of the assertions in Mt. 28 : 19 that "*all* authority in heaven and on earth has been given to me" and in Col. 1 : 20 that God was pleased "through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven."²

6. Summary. First, since the pre-existent One decisively entered this world to make God manifest, to look at Jesus is to see that it is the nature of God to be, and to will to be, with his creation. Second, it is notable that the divine splendour was made manifest only in deepest identification with man, for only by "taking the form of a servant" was Jesus "in the form of God." Third, in these two forms of Jesus' activity he became the one through whom God's redemptive purpose is accomplished within creation. Henceforth the sinful first Adam's "dominion" over the world can not ultimately prevail against the fitness (טוב) of the world to serve God's purpose. Fourth, the circumstance that when he abandoned himself to the extent of death Jesus was the one "in the form of God," the pre-existent one (cf. II Cor. 5 : 19, *God* was reconciling the world to himself), indicates that God works within the changes of history, within this world, in order to accomplish his unchanging redemptive purpose for history and the world. The servant form of Jesus' lordship guarantees that though the creation is not the source of redemption, yet it is the place within which the redemptive purpose is consummated. Fifth, the Church's worship is on behalf of the creation and is a witness that under Jesus' lordship the creation is being moved in the direction of "the glory of God the Father." It is clear in this hymn that the purpose of the cross concerned not only the Church, but rather was that the creation may respond

¹ *Ibid.*, p. 65: "In applying the monotheism of the Jewish faith both to the Father and to Jesus Christ, Paul reflects the polemical force of the Christian mission and combats a polytheistic Hellenism."

² Cullmann, *Christology*, 227-31. "The fundamental distinction, then, between all the members of the lordship of Christ and the members of the Church is that the former do not know that they belong to this lordship, whereas the latter do know it" (231).

affirmatively (and to its own "good") to the redemptive lordship of Christ.

D) Judgments about *religionsgeschichtliche* influences on Pauline theology as a whole have their effect on interpretations of Paul's motif of the relation between creation and redemption, as was briefly shown in Chapter II. Investigations of possible parallels to the Philippian hymn have been extensive and they are no less determinative for interpretation of this motif. Since several useful summaries of *religionsgeschichtlich* study of Phil. 2: 6-11 are available, it is sensible simply to state the position which appears most prudent in light of the preceding description of the hymn itself and Paul's use of it.¹

R. N. Longenecker rightly observes that the time is ripe, since discovery of Dead Sea and Nag Hammadi texts, "for a new application of the old comparative-religion methodology which gives promise of more adequately based results." In particular this means the end of the older process of "Hellenistic subtraction" from the total of New Testament theology, doing so on the basis of pre-suppositions about "what was possible in a Hebraic milieu," and thus "acclaiming the residue to be Semitic and primitive (oblivious to the intermingling of Hebraic and Hellenistic ideologies in first-century Palestine)."²

If one attempts this new application with reference to the Philippian passage, it appears unlikely, as the foregoing discussion of the text has intimated, that a simple result will obtain, such as either Jewish influences only or Greek influences only,³ or such as

¹ J. M. Furness, "Behind the Philippian Hymn," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 178-82; Gnlika, *Der Philipperbrief* (1968), pp. 138-44; Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 287-319.

² Longenecker, "Some Distinctive Early Christological Motifs," *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 526.

³ M. Dibelius, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature* (Hertford, England: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1936), p. 254 (cf. pp. 246-54), suggested that Christian hymns in general were later forms influenced by Hellenism and tinged by Gnosticism. In the anti-gnostic efforts after the middle of the second century, "the non-biblical hymns were entirely suppressed in the Church. It is on this account that our knowledge of primitive Christian hymns is so sparing."

Independently from this rather sweeping theory, Ernst Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (*BHT*, IX; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933), has contended that the gnostic "perfect man" stands behind the conception of Christ in Phil. 2: 5ff. (163); that gnostic theology of the εἰκὼν informs the Christology of Col., Phil. 2: 5ff., and the concept of being ἐν Χριστῷ (167); and that Paul

determining the *Sitz im Leben* to be only Baptism or contrariwise only Communion.¹ The major question concerning possible influences on this hymn is no longer the simpler one of whether a dualistic cosmology (Iranian, gnostic, or apocalyptic) is understood to be implicit in the hymn, or whether, on the other hand, this hymn and Paul's use of it accord with Paul's view of the relation between creation and redemption which has been observed in I Cor. 8 : 6, Rom. 5 : 12ff. and 8 : 18ff.²

R. P. Martin's conclusion is correct:

Clearly, the author of Philippians ii.6-11 stands at the junction of two cultures and two religious traditions. His background is Jewish, but it is Greek ideas which stand at the forefront of his mind; and he is concerned, as a Christian, to relate the Gospel to the larger world of Hellenism.³

used the gnostic combination of *αἰών* and *εἰκών* conceptions (168). The study of *μορφή*, which follows in the next section of this chapter, shows, rather, that the Jewish concept of Adam is the primary source of the *εἰκών*-Christology of this hymn.

E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*², has forcefully argued, on the other hand, that the Christology of this hymn is indebted to Jewish sources rather than to a gnostic redeemer-myth: "Gewiss geht Phil. 2, 6-8 über die Weisheitsvorstellung hinaus. Aber *was dieses Hymnus zwingt, anders zu formulieren, ist die Tatsache des irdischen Lebens Jesu. Und dieses ist mit dem typisch jüdischen Motiv der Selbsterniedrigung des Leidenden Gerechten gemalt, nicht mit den Bildern eines gnostischen Erlösermythos*" (100-101). Further, the circumstance that such concepts as the "form of God" and "equality with God" were primary causes of the gospel being "a stumbling-block to Jews" (I Cor. 1 : 23) did not prevent the early Jewish-Christian church from asserting that "God has made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2 : 36). Cf. further, in favor of the primarily Jewish background of Phil. 2 : 5-11: J. Daniélou, *op. cit.*, p. 150; A. D. Nock, *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964), pp. viii-ix.

¹ The material has been reviewed by both Feuillet, *RB*, LXXII (1965), 481-9 and Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-33, and they agree that no definite sacramental *Sitz im Leben* can be fixed. Jervell, *Imago Dei*, pp. 197-213, 227-31, who equated *μορφή* and *εἰκών* (204f.), argued that the *Sitz im Leben* is baptism, where soteriology and ethics meet.

² The simpler alternative only was seen in the dissertation. Cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*² (1955), pp. 67-70, 266, 274; Hoskyns and Davey, *The Riddle of the New Testament*³ (London: Faber & Faber, 1947), pp. 153-61; W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1939), p. 181; Lohmeyer, *Kyrios Jesus*² (1961), pp. 23-29; E. Schweizer, "Zur Herkunft der Präexistenzvorstellung bei Paulus," *Neotestamentica*, pp. 107, 109.

³ Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 297-9; cf. pp. 287-319. Cf. André Louf, "Une ancienne exégèse de Phil 2, 6 dans le KeTābā DeMasqātā (Livre des degrés)," *Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, volumen secundum (Rome, 1963), 523-33.

It is thus found that the Philippian hymn, no less than the confession of faith cited in I Cor. 8 : 6, expresses Paul's own development of the implication of Jesus' lordship for the relation between creation and redemption. The facts are that no exact *Sitzen im Leben* have been determined for these pre-Pauline pieces, that we have both texts only in their Pauline context, and that the primary source for discovering their meaning is Paul's use of them.¹ Continuity of themes from Rom. 5 : 12ff. and 8 : 19ff., 38-39 to I Cor. 8 : 6 and Phil. 2 : 6ff. shows that both Paul and some significant early Church tradition were agreed upon the relation between creation and redemption under Jesus' lordship.² Though Paul's exploration of the implications of that lordship is effected by, and developed in the context of, the Gentile Hellenism to which he was called to minister, no break occurs with earlier understanding of Jesus' status before Church and world.

¹ Cf. Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 131ff.; J. A. Sanders, *JBL*, LXXXVIII (1969), 290.

² Cf. *supra* pp. 57-58, 72-73, 89-90.

CHAPTER FIVE

CREATION AND REDEMPTION ACCORDING TO POST(?)-PAULINE USE OF TRADITION (Col. 1 : 15-20; Eph. 1 : 3-14)

The apostle Paul's conception of the relation between creation and redemption has been described in the last two chapters on the basis of two strata of material, namely Paul's own writing and his approving use of earlier tradition concerning Christ's lordship over creation and redemption.

Widespread disagreement about authorship of Colossians and Ephesians justifies separate treatment of Col. 1 : 15-20 and especially Eph. 1 : 3-14, but this separation is not intended to imply that Paul's authorship has been disproved.¹ If Paul wrote Colossians, the Christological hymn in that letter would be another instance in the second stratum of Pauline material, but since it has not been proved that he wrote Colossians, the evidence from that letter ought not be placed on the same level as that from Romans, I Corinthians and Philippians. The problem of Ephesian authorship, though partly dependent on a decision about the provenance of Colossians, is more complicated and it is improbable that Paul wrote it.²

¹ W. G. Kümmel (ed.), *Introduction to the New Testament*¹⁴ (New York: Abingdon, 1966), pp. 240-44, surveys discussion about authorship and considers Col. to be "doubtless Pauline." C. F. D. Moule, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (CGTC; Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1957), pp. 13-14, 60-62 affirms Pauline authorship. Robin Scroggs, *The Last Adam* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966), p. 62 n. 5 observes concerning Phil. 2 : 6ff. and Col. 1 : 15ff.: "Had Paul disagreed with these hymns, he would hardly have quoted them; they can thus be used to determine his thought." According to N. Hugedé, *Commentaire de l'Épître aux Colossiens* (Geneva: Labor & Fides, 1968), pp. 48ff., in Col. 1 : 15ff. Paul reworked a hymn of the primitive Church. N. Kehl, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief* (Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967), p. 51 (cf. p. 92), finds difficulty on basis of conceptual analysis, but not on basis of stylistic comparison, in affirming Pauline authorship of the Col. hymn.

² C. F. D. Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 14, is uncertain about authorship of Eph. Eduard Lohse, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (K-EKNT, 9 : 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968), pp. 30f., discusses relation between Col. and Eph. H. Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*,

Eph. 1:3–14 probably represents a third stratum in the *corpus Paulinum*, namely post-Pauline use of tradition, and it is possible that Col. 1:15–20 belongs in the same category. Even if it were concluded that Paul wrote neither Colossians nor Ephesians, the influence of Paul's thought on both letters is clear enough. It is thus presupposed that the two texts in question are embedded in the *corpus Paulinum* and represent at least indirect, if not direct, evidence of a Pauline use of tradition.

I. COLOSSIANS 1:15–20

The Christological hymn in Colossians speaks to the relation between creation and redemption not merely by use of some cosmological terms but directly and explicitly, like the hymn in Philipians, through its Christology of the Lord. On the one hand, there is the relation between creation and Christ (1:15–17) and, on the other hand, the relation between redemption and Christ (1:18ff.), so that creation and redemption are related through "the beloved son" (1:13), previously designated as "our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:3).¹ Judgments about the authorship and structure of the hymn, as well as about its relation to its context and to possible *religions-geschichtliche* sources, influence understanding of the hymn's motif

12 (1966), 234, distinguishes four levels of theological formulation: Credo, Paul's interpretation in Rom. 6, Colossian transformation of his doctrine of baptism into "timeless phenomenology of salvation existence," and further development in Eph. Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheser-Briefe* (*Skrifter Utgivna Av. Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund*, XXXIX; Lund: Gleerup, 1946), pp. 16–66, especially p. 66, presents the most extensive study of the authorship of Ephesians and Colossians, and concludes in favor of Pauline authorship of both.

¹ Martin Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (HNT, XII; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927), p. 6, thinks the Christological excursus 1:15–20 is in two parts: "es handelt sich also bis mit 1, 17 um die kosmologische, von da an um die soteriologische Bedeutung Christi. ...Es kommt dem Apostel offenbar darauf an, die Parallelität von Schöpfung und Erlösung zu zeigen." Cf. also Ralph P. Martin, "An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1:15–20)," *EQ*, XXXVI (1964), 196, 200; N. Kehl, *Christushymnus*, pp. 89, 99. Markus Barth, in his review of Kehl's monograph, *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 106–10, maintains that since a hymn is not discourse, one cannot say that the first stanza concerns only creation and the second only salvation. Cf. list of interpretations of the hymn (not in commentaries) compiled by Lohse, *Kolosser*, pp. 77–78 n. 2; and *Forschungsbericht* of Hans Jakob Gabathuler, *Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche—Haupt der Welt* (ATANT, 45; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1965).

of creation and redemption, though the most important factor is interpretation of the Christological descriptions.

A) Since the formal literary style of 1:15–20 is markedly different from its context, since the hymn abounds in relative clauses (which characterize liturgical style or credal formulae—cf. Phil. 2:6, 1 Tim. 3:16, Heb. 1:3),¹ since there are five *hapax legomena* of Pauline usage in these six verses (ὁρατά, θρόνοι, κυριότητες, πρωτεύων, εἰρηνοποιήσας) besides other unusual features,² and since the Christology of the passage is alleged to be an “advance on anything else in Paul’s commonly accepted letters,”³ there are good reasons to deny that the author of Colossians wrote this hymn.

Käsemann has developed the most extensive theory about the provenance of the hymn. He traces three steps in the *Sitz im Leben* of this text: first, a pre-Christian gnostic poem which, second, was taken over by Christian usage in a baptismal liturgical reinterpretation and, third, which was then cited by the author of Colossians

¹ E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos* (Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913), p. 253 n. 2. Cf. A. M. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*² (London: SCM, 1961), p. 124.

The prose style is interrupted at 1:15 by a formal, poetic style which continues through 1:20 and which uses parallels and repetition (though a prayer-form is in 1:12–14 as introduction to the hymn). Some characteristics of this section: First, repetition of ἔστιν propositions which provide a series of affirmations about Christ. Second, repetition of various forms of πᾶς which emphasizes the universal scope of Christ’s work. Third, in the middle of this text there occur side by side two clauses which begin καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν, the first clause concerning creation (which is the primary subject matter of 1:15–17) and the second clause concerning the Church (and probably introducing the next section, 1:18–20, whose subject matter is redemption). It is thus implied that creation and redemption are interrelated through the κεφαλὴ of 1:17–18a, a term which refers to the “same One” (αὐτός) who is πρὸ παντῶν καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν. Fourth, 1:15–20 forms a tightly constructed unity which progresses, perhaps by means of chiasmic parallelism, from ζς (1:15) to αὐτός (1:17) and from another αὐτός (1:18a) to the final ζς (1:18b).

² C. Masson, *L’Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens* (CNT, X; Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950), p. 106 n. 2, maintains that the hymn is probably not by Paul for reasons of both style and thought. Concerning the first: “Ces cinq versets contiennent une douzaine de termes ou d’expressions que nous ne rencontrons pas dans les épîtres reconnues authentiques.” Cf. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, pp. 125–26. Another piece of evidence indicating that 1:15–20 is a separate unit is the fact that all personal references are absent from 1:15–20, though both preceding and following contexts are marked by the incidence of personal pronouns (ὑμεῖς and ἡμῶν), stressing thereby the experiential basis of Paul’s gospel.

³ Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, p. 126. Cf. Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 129, footnote 7; R. P. Martin, “An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1:15–20),” *EQ*, XXXVI (1964), 205 n. 26.

in ironic refutation of the gnostic counter-movement at Colossae. First, there are un-Pauline elements, such as πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν and ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλῆρωμα κατοικῆσαι (1: 19), which suggest an underlying gnostic mythical source.¹ Second, as evidence of liturgical use of the text in the baptismal service, Käsemann maintains the following: (1) The "Son of his love" in 1: 13 alludes to "my beloved Son" in Mark 1: 11; (2) salvation from the power of darkness and into the kingdom of his Son is a result of baptism and has ancient parallels in Egypt and in mystery religions; (3) 2: 10ff. speaks of baptism and Colossians must be understood on the basis of the section in which those verses occur; (4) the Christian circumcision of 2: 11 is paralleled by the "putting off" of 3: 5ff.² Third, if the author was citing an ancient credal statement, the effect for the Colossians would have been recognition of a dual authority for refutation of the Counter-movement: not only the authority of the apostolic office (invoked in 1: 21–2: 3), but also the authority of a widely used credal statement which had already been used against Gnosticism.³

Though it has been questioned whether the hymn was originally gnostic, whether it had precisely a baptismal usage, and whether it was directed against (and thus must be understood in the light of) the Colossian heresy, nevertheless the probability remains high that the Christological hymn is a pre-Pauline composition that was used by the author of Colossians, though it is possible that Paul

¹ Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie," in E. Wolf (ed.), *Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann zum 65. Geburtstag Überreicht* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1949), p. 139. K. "demythologizes," as does Bultmann, the cosmic references which he ascribes to gnostic sources, restricts the "new creation" to the Church, and sets all cosmological statements in opposition against the doctrine of forgiveness of sins (*ibid.*, pp. 134, 141–42, 145–46). Cf. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (London: SCM, 1952 and 1955), I, 178–79; II, 150. J. Jervell, *Imago Dei* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960), p. 225, also finds gnostic influence here.

² Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie," pp. 140–42.

³ Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufliturgie," p. 144, maintains that since the author of Col. appeals to apostolic authority by referring to Paul, this appeal evidences the voice of "das nachapostolische Zeitalter." Paul's appeal to authority was quite different: "Auch Paulus hat sich Röm. 1: 3f.; Phil. 2: 5ff. auf ein formuliertes Bekenntnis und an vielen Stellen auf die Liturgie bezogen. Aber er tut es, wie Phil. 2: 5ff. gut beweist, gelegentlich, nicht grundsätzlich, in Freiheit und nicht in der Ehrfurcht vor dem werdenden Dogma" (p. 148 n. 73).

wrote both Colossians and the hymn.¹ The usefulness of the hymn for determining Pauline thought will depend on: (1) one's judgment about the relation of the hymn to its context *if* it is considered probable that Paul wrote Colossians; (2) decisions about possible additions to the hymn by Paul, if he wrote Colossians; (3) conclusions about agreement of thought between the hymn as it is used in Colossians and theology that is undoubtedly Paul's.²

B) Various attempts have been made to present the structure of 1: 15-20. The earliest *formgeschichtlich* approach was that by Norden, who proposed that the "hymn" consisted of two strophes, each beginning with ὅς, and who pointed out the parallel between ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (1: 15) and ὅς ἐστιν ἀρχή (1: 18b), the parallel between ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα (1: 16) and ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (1: 19), the parallel between the two καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν clauses (1: 17-18a), the parallel between the two occurrences of πρωτότοκος (1: 15, 18b), etc.³

Lohmeyer contended that, in spite of the formal structure, the syntax is not lucid, "nicht in regelmässiger Unterordnung," but is in rhetorical style:

Dann leiten drei Zeilen zu einem siebenzeiligen Gebilde über, das von der Stellung Christi in aller Schöpfung berichtet; ihm schliesst sich wieder ein Dreizeiler an, der erneut zu einer siebenzeiligen

¹ Cf. Gabathuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-61; Deichgräber, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (SUNT, V; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), pp. 152-55; Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 51; Lohse, *op. cit.*, pp. 83-85; Lohse, "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians," *NTSt*, 15 (1969), 217ff. The contention, on the other hand, that Pauline authorship of this hymn has not been disproved depends also on decisions about style, context, vocabulary and doctrine: Paul uses formal style elsewhere, a vocabulary which includes *hapax legomena* is to be found in other writings which are unquestionably Pauline, Paul's theology was capable of diverse expression and growth as Paul continued to see more implications of the lordship of Christ, and the hymn is integral to its context. Cf. Moule, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Hagedé, *op. cit.*, p. 48ff.

² This writer agrees with the position that Col. was written by Paul and that Paul made use of an earlier hymn. As Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, p. 82 points out, however, we do not know enough about early Church cult to restrict this hymn to use in baptism.

³ Norden, *op. cit.*, p. 252; Ralph P. Martin, "An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1: 15-20)," p. 195. Cf. Hunter, *Paul and his Predecessors*, pp. 124-25, who provides an English translation of Norden's analysis. According to Norden, both form and content reflect an early tradition which may have originated in Hellenistic Judaism (253).

Strophe hinführt. So ist die Periode in einer gewissen äusseren Symmetrie gehalten, welche die doppelte Stellung Christi klar hervorhebt.¹

According to Lohmeyer, the hymn consists of two strophes, each in seven lines (1 : 15–16e; 1 : 18–20), which are connected by a section of three lines (1 : 16f.–17).

Käsemann thinks that the hymn consists, rather, of two strophes, each in six lines (1 : 15–16; 1 : 18b–20), which are connected by 1 : 17–18a. This interpretation considers 1 : 18a (the clause concerning the Church) and 1 : 20b (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ σταυροῦ αὐτοῦ) to be interpolations.² Masson excludes the clause concerning the Church, but includes the reference to the blood of the cross. According to Masson, the parallelism is more Semitic than Greek, and is evident in the structure which consists of five strophes of four lines each (1 : 15–16b, 16c–f, 17–18, 19–20b, 20c–f).³ Ernst Bammel contends that the hymn consists of two strophes, each containing chiasmic parallelism and each being introduced by ἕς ἔστιν, but his interpretation does not give sufficient emphasis to the parallel occurrence of αὐτός ἔστιν in 1 : 17 and 1 : 18.⁴ J. M. Robinson attempts to rearrange the text and remove what he considers to be Pauline additions.⁵ Hegermann, Gabathuler, Deichgräber, Kehl, and Lohse have continued the quest for an hypothetical original form of the hymn.⁶

The fact is that scholarship has developed no consensus about the

¹ E. Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*⁸ (K-EKNT, IX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1930), zweite Hälfte, pp. 41–42.

² Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufiturgie," pp. 134–35. Cf. Schweizer, "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den Paulinischen Antilegomena," *Neotestamentica*, p. 298: 16b, 18a, 18c, and 20c add to the hymn the theology of the author of Colossians.

³ Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 105. P. Ellingworth, "Colossians 1 : 15–20 and its Context," *ET*, LXXIII (1962), 252–53, argues against Masson that there are two strophes, there being "a clear division at the end of v. 17," and that, though the hymn was originally pre-Pauline, the hymn and its context are so inter-related as to indicate that Paul "is responsible for placing the passage in its present context."

⁴ Ernst Bammel, "Versuch zu Col. 1 : 15–20," *ZNW*, LII (1961), 94–95.

⁵ James M. Robinson, "Formal Analysis of Col. 1 : 15–20," *JBL*, LXXVI (1957), 270–87.

⁶ Hegermann, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU, 82; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961), pp. 92f.; Gabathuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 130f.; Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 146–52; Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 28–51 and "auf der Innenseite der Klappe."

number and content of strophes in Col. 1 : 15–20, or about possible Pauline additions, so that one may safely speak only of certain parallels, such as those observed by Norden. No single reconstruction is fully persuasive.

There remain several syntactical problems. First, the clauses in 1 : 16, 19 are subordinate causal clauses, giving the evidential reason for the statement which each modifies.¹ In 1 : 16 the *ὅτι* explains the preceding *πρωτότοκος* and indicates, against a tenet of Gnosticism, that the “beloved Son” is not included in *πᾶσα κτίσις*. The *ὅτι* of 1 : 19 modifies not only the preceding *ὅτι* clause, but the whole *ὅς ἐστιν* clause of 1 : 18. “The correspondence with *ὅτι* in ver. 16, following *ὅς ἐστιν* of ver. 15, shows that this assigns a reason, not for *ὅτι γέννηται*, but for *ὅς ἐστιν*, ver. 18.”²

Second, what does the *ὅτι* clause of 1 : 18b modify? Lightfoot thinks that it combines Christ’s supremacy in the universe (1 : 15–17) and the Church (1 : 18), “explaining this twofold sovereignty by the absolute indwelling of the *pleroma* in Christ.”³ The transition from the *ἐστιν* verbs to the *γέννηται* (Aorist) marks a contrast between what Christ is and what he becomes in the *Heilsgeschichte* of redemption. The *ὅτι* clause designates the character of the *ἔσχατον* toward which his resurrection moves.

Third, what is the subject of *εὐδόκησεν* in 1 : 19? Possibilities which have been suggested are: God, the *πλήρωμα*, the Son, and the Spirit.⁴ Against “Son” is the fact that for Paul not the Son but the Father forms the eternal purpose (cf. II Cor. 5 : 19, Eph. 1 : 19, etc.). Against *πλήρωμα* is the strangeness of the expression and the fact that the masculine *ειρηνοποιήσας* modifies the subject of *εὐδό-*

¹ R. W. Funk (tr. and rev.), Blass and Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*¹⁰ (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1961), par. 456.

² T. K. Abbott, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (ICC; New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1897), p. 218.

³ J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul’s Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*⁸ (London: Macmillan, 1886), p. 141.

⁴ A. S. Peake, “The Epistle to the Colossians,” in Nicoll (ed.), *The Expositor’s Greek Testament* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), III, 507. G. Munderlein, “Die Erwählung durch das Pleroma,” *NTSt*, 8 (1962), who sees no cosmic significance in the indwelling of the Pleroma, agrees with Aalen “dass *pleroma* Kol. i. 19; ii. 9 ein *Parallelbegriff* zu Schekina ist” (275). Cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 120–25.

κησεν, which would exclude the neuter πλήρωμα from being that subject.¹

In favor of the view that ὁ θεός is understood as subject are the above mentioned difficulties concerning the alternative views plus the following considerations. First, Col. 2 : 9 ("For in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily") *may* be taken as indicative of the author's intention in Col. 1 : 19. Second, if Paul's Christology was *primarily* functional rather than metaphysical, it is more reasonable to find in this text the idea of God willing his power to dwell in Christ than the idea of the ontological fullness of the deity dwelling in Christ.² It may be remarked also that the omission of ὁ θεός is not serious, for εὐδοκία is used absolutely of God's purpose in Luke 2 : 14 and Phil. 2 : 13 (cf. James 1 : 12; 4 : 6).³ But it also remains possible that the subject may be the Spirit, as will be seen in discussion of πλήρωμα.

C) At stake in the question how the hymn is related to its context is the problem whether the use of the hymn in Colossians affirms the cosmic meaning of the hymn or rejects it, in effect, by "translating" from cosmic to soteriological or "Christianized" meaning.⁴ Evidence in the context does not lead to the conclusion, it will be argued here, that the hymn's cosmic meaning was unusable to the author of Colossians. Those who argue to the contrary appear to be doing so on the basis of presupposing that Pauline theology was in opposition to any cosmic meaning.⁵

The ες and αὐτός clauses in 1 : 15-20 identify further "the Son of his love" in 1 : 13, and the smoothness of the transition indicates that for the author of the letter there is no dichotomy between the

¹ Cf. Moule, *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 70f.

² Cf. II Cor. 5 : 19 and Col. 3 : 2, however, which may not be periphrastic, but ontological statements that "God was in Christ" and that Christ is "above," respectively. Nevertheless, if πλήρωμα is a *nomen actionis*, it is likely that "God" is the subject of εὐδοκῆσεν.

³ Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 156f.

⁴ Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 176. Cf. D. von Allmen, "Reconciliation du monde et christologie cosmique, de II Cor. 5 : 14-21 à Col. 1 : 15-23," *RHPR*, 48 (1968), 32-45, who is persuaded that the author of Col. quoted the hymn and, by glosses in the hymn and commentary in vss. 21-23, reinterpreted it in a Pauline anthropological sense.

⁵ E.g.: Bultmann, *Theology*, I, 191, 228ff.; Gabathuler, *op. cit.*, pp. 167, 180f.; Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 202; Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 67, 71, 163; Lohse, "Pauline Theology," *NTSt*, 15 (1969), 211-20; J. M. Robinson, "World in Modern Theology and in New Testament Theology," in J. M. Richards (ed.), *Soli Deo Gloria* (Richmond: John Knox, 1968), pp. 106ff.

descriptions in the hymn and the Christology just referred to in the prayer and in allusions to the Colossian Christian experience. The sentence which begins at 1:9 continues without break through 1:20, as Nestle's text indicates, if not as far as 1:23, as the *καὶ* of 1:21 might imply and as Westcott and Hort punctuate it.

Otto Piper has pointed out that the petitions of Paul's prayer in 1:9-14 would seem exaggerated and irrational were it not for this Christological section which indicates that Paul's prayer is entirely in line with the work and capacity of Christ. The repetition of various forms of *πᾶς* in the prayer, for example, presupposes the Christological foundation which Paul indicates in the following verses where *πᾶς* is again repeated.¹

There is evident a continuous movement of thought from 1:3 to 2:7. The section 1:3-8 deals with the Colossian Christian experience; 1:9-14 contains Paul's prayer for the Colossians (that they may be filled with such a practical knowledge of God's will as to live a life worthy of the Lord by bearing fruit, by increasing in the knowledge of God, by being strengthened according to his glorious might, and by giving thanks to the Father); 1:15-20 contains the Christological section on the Son's person and work; 1:21-29 deals with the apostle's ministry; and 2:1-7 returns to the Colossian Christian experience. A further indication of the unity of thought is the fact that *εὐχαριστοῦμεν* occurs in 1:3, *εὐχαριστοῦντες* in 1:12, and *εὐχαριστία* in 2:7. The whole of section 1:3-2:7 thus constitutes a long circular movement of thought which begins with thanksgiving and the Colossians where they are, and returns, after prayer, confession of faith, and the apostle's own experience, to the same point of thanksgiving.²

The hymn is integral, accordingly, to the whole argument. Even the debatable contention that the hymn was a Christian baptismal liturgical reinterpretation of a pre-Christian gnostic poem is an hypothesis which depends partly on demonstration of continuity between the hymn and its context (the reference in 2:10ff. to baptism and the insistence that all of Colossians must be understood on the basis of the section in which those verses occur).³

¹ Otto A. Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work: an Exegesis of Col. 1:9-29," *Interp.*, III (1949), 290.

² This paragraph is indebted to the late Howard T. Kuist, in a lecture at Princeton Theological Seminary in Spring, 1961.

³ Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufiturgie," pp. 140-42.

D) The hymn is marked by its multiplication of descriptions for "the beloved Son," each title providing a perspective on the relation between creation and redemption, the major ones being: εἰκὼν, πρωτότοκος, κεφαλὴ, ἀρχή, and πλήρωμα.

1. Ἐικὼν. This term does not refer to "the essence of a thing," as Kleinknecht held, but rather to Christ's revelatory function.¹ Mediation in creation, accordingly, is not asserted by this title, unless one can support the theory that Col. 1 : 15 is an exegesis of Gen. 1 : 26 and considers Christ to have been like the "plan which the artist has in his head," or the "*Vorstellungsbild*" or "model" with which God created the world.² Whether the latter interpretation may be accepted depends on what *religionsgeschichtliche* source is seen behind the term.

In light of the history of this term's interpretation, it appears probable that εἰκὼν is neither directly Jewish (Hugedé, Lohmeyer) nor directly Greek (Eltester), but Hellenistic-Jewish in origin of meaning as used in Col. 1 : 15.³ Lohse and Kehl, among others, have shown that the hymn does not refer to a supra-historical metaphysical drama of the gnostic Redeemer—i.e., the hymn is not sourced in myth.⁴ Further, εἰκὼν is not to be interpreted directly in light of Plato, *Timaeus* 92 C (εἰκὼν τοῦ νοητοῦ θεοῦ αἰσθητός).⁵ The hymn is used in Colossians in such a way that "the image of the unseen God" is bound closely to history, so that both gnostic and Greek thought are not in control here. Such Hellenistic-Jewish texts as Prov. 8 : 22, Wisdom 7 : 25ff. (and cf. both Sirach 1 : 1ff.; 24 : 8f. and non-Jewish *CH* 11 : 15; 12 : 15) Philo's *Legum allegoriae* I, 43, III, 96, and *Quod deus immutabilis sit* 142f., provide a more convincing background of the meaning of εἰκὼν, as Deichgräber,

¹ Kleinknecht, "εἰκὼν," *TWNT*, II, 386. Cf. Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes* (*Études Bibliques*; Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966), p. 174; Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

² Cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 69–70, who disagrees with this interpretation.

³ Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse*, pp. 166–72, provides an history of interpretation. He concludes that "Prov. 8 : 22 and Col. 1 : 15–16 are inseparable" (270). Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (*K-EKNT*, V; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), pp. 220–21 surveys interpretation of εἰκὼν. Cf. F.-W. Eltester, *Eikon im Neuen Testament* (*Beih. ZNW*, 23; Berlin, 1958); Hugedé, *op. cit.*; Lohmeyer, *op. cit.*

⁴ Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 47f., 78ff., 87, 104; Gerhard Koch, "Jesus Christus—Schöpfer der Welt," *ZTK*, LVI (1950), 86; Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 83. Since Kehl is a specialist in Gnosticism, his judgment against gnostic influence in this hymn is the more notable.

⁵ Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

Feuillet, Lohse and others have argued.¹ The background is, as Conzelmann writes, "kosmologische und soteriologische Ideen des Judentums, die sich im Zusammenhang mit der σοφία-Spekulation entwickeln."²

Only in connection with the following description πρωτότοκος can the implication of the term εἰκὼν for the relation between creation and redemption become clear, as Lohse has well said:

Die christliche Gemeinde wendet den Begriff εἰκὼν auf Christus an, um ihn als den einen zu preisen, in dem Gott sich offenbart. Als die εἰκὼν des unsichtbaren Gottes steht er nicht auf der Seite des Geschaffenen, sondern des Schöpfers, der in Christus an der Welt und mit der Welt handelt. Er ist dem Kosmos, der gesamten Schöpfung im Himmel und auf Erden, schlechthin übergeordnet. Darum tritt zum ersten Hoheitsprädikat das zweite: πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.³

The meaning of εἰκὼν is decidedly Pauline, as the combination of terms shared in common between Col. 1 : 10-14 and II Cor. 4 : 4-6 indirectly indicates (δόξα, φῶς, γνῶσις-ἐπίγνωσις, σκότος), and especially as Paul's language in II Cor. 4 : 4 makes clear: ...τῆς δόξης τοῦ χριστοῦ, ὃς ἐστὶν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ.⁴

2. Πρωτότοκος. If εἰκὼν emphasized Christ's relation to God, implying Christ's pre-existence, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως designates Christ's relation to the creation.⁵ The term πρωτότοκος is frequently used (one hundred thirty times) in the LXX, mostly in genealogies and historical treatments, to indicate not temporal priority but sovereignty of rank.⁶ The πρωτότοκος is here "the son of his love," remindful of Zech. 12 : 10-13 : 7 (LXX) which uses both terms: ἀγαπητός and πρωτότοκος. The "Sovereign of all creation" is the "one who has been pierced," the Shepherd that is stricken by God (Zech 13 : 7), who thus bears the marks of the Suffering Servant of II Isaiah.⁷

As the phrase πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν (Col. 1 : 18; cf. I Cor.

¹ Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 152ff.; Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse*, pp. 189-91; Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, pp. 83-87.

² Conzelmann, *I Kor.*, p. 221 n. 71.

³ Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 87.

⁴ Cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 57-63.

⁵ Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse*, pp. 175-94, provides history of interpretation. Cf. Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 98; Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

⁶ History of interpretation (temporal priority or sovereignty) is provided by T. K. Abbott, *op. cit.*, pp. 210-12. Cf. Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 88.

⁷ So argues Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-54.

15 : 20; Acts 26 : 23) shows, using the term again "*als reiner Hoheits-titel*," Christ is the "Sovereign" by virtue of his resurrection. The resurrection "has cosmic relevance," for it inaugurates the release of creation from enslavement by man's sin (cf. Rom. 8 : 21, 29) and thus implies that the Christian does not await the apocalyptic annihilation of the universe—i.e., the latter is not God's intention.¹

Verses 16–17 provide commentary on the *πρωτότοκος* title, making clear (in agreement with I Cor. 8 : 6) that God is the Creator (as passive *ἐκτίσθη* states) and that Christ is the means (*ἐν αὐτῷ*) whereby the universe is held together.² As Otto Piper has well said:

...Paul intimates in the sublime and profound hymn Col. 1 : 15–20 that as the *prototokos* the Son imparts the mark of sonship to everything that exists (Col. 1 : 15–17). By the fact that everything in this world is made through him all things in this world are interdependent. They exist through each other thereby sharing the creative power of the Son, and as an expression of the Son's oneness of will which is directed towards God, they also are held together (v. 17) and exist for each other.³

The *πρωτότοκος* is not, then, just the pre-existent Wisdom of Wisdom literature, but is the Sovereign who is installed by God through resurrection as Lord over not only the Church but the whole universe.⁴

3. *Κεφαλή*. The question has been raised whether the hymn originally described Christ as "head" of the cosmos or of the Church, and the majority of contemporary opinion is in favor of treating

¹ Cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 89–92; Michaelis, "*πρωτότοκος*," *TWNT*, VI, 878–79; James P. Martin, "Cosmic Christ and Cosmic Redemption," *Affirmation*, I (1967), 29–31.

² Concerning *ἐκτίσθη*, cf. Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 88. Fred B. Craddock, " 'All Things in Him': A Critical Note on Col. I. 15–20," *NTSt*, 12 (1965), 78–80, favors local meaning in opposition to Hegermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 107–08, 165–66, who maintains that the Son is "in all things." Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 90 n. 4, rightly supports the instrumental meaning. Cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 107; Feuillet, "La création de l'univers 'dans le Christ' d'après l'Épître aux Colossiens (1, 16a)," *NTSt*, 12 (1965), 1–9.

³ Piper, "The Transforming Power of the Gospel," *TTod*, XII (1956), 447; cf. Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work: an Exegesis of Col. 1 : 9–29," *Interp*, III (1949), 293, who maintains that *πρωτότοκος* is both temporal and ontic. Cf. Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 88.

⁴ Cf. M. Barth's review of Kehl's book in *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 108. Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 99, shows differences between Christ and Wisdom. Contrary view in Hegermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 98f. Cf. Bo Reicke, "*πᾶς*," *TWNT*, V, 886–96.

τῆς ἐκκλησίας as an addition to the original hymn, so that the Christian redactor would have transformed a cosmic into an ecclesiological and soteriological statement.¹ Käsemann describes the addition as an effort to historicize a timeless and mythic gnostic hymn, but Schweizer sees it as an Hellenistic-Christian misunderstanding in cosmic terms of Pauline ecclesiology.² Kehl argues, to the contrary, that τῆς ἐκκλησίας belongs to the original hymn in a transitional "middle strophe," and that it is essential to the meaning of verse 18a.³ Arguments from strophic balance are so precarious that it is not certain that τῆς ἐκκλησίας could not have belonged to the original hymn, but it is clear that many scholars tend to see in Pauline literature consistent transitions from cosmic to soteriological meaning. Kehl's argument, in spite of its relative solitude, is more convincing.

At whatever time the reference to the Church was written into the hymn, the essential point is that κεφαλή provides not a biological but a juridical analogy.⁴ This title is as much one of sovereignty as is πρωτότοκος. There is, then, no "cosmic Man" behind the hymn and no basis for the problem raised by Hegermann, namely:

Wie kann das All, das ‚par nature‘ schon den Schöpfungsmittler zur κεφαλή τοῦ σώματος hatte, überhaupt einer Erlösung bedürftig sein, und wie kann der Schöpfungsmittler zu seiner kosmischen Hauptstellung, die er ‚par nature‘ ewig innehat, in der Zeit kraft göttlicher Erwählung erhöht werden?⁵

The cosmos is never described in Pauline literature as the body of Christ in the way that the Church is (Col. 1 : 24), but Christ is "head" in the juridical sense not only of the Church but also of the universe, as is stated also in Col. 2 : 10 (ὅς ἐστιν ἡ κεφαλή πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας) and as is implied in the concept of dying with Christ to the στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου (Col. 2 : 8, 20; cf. Gal. 4 : 3, 9).⁶ The hymn, no less than its context in Colossians, declares that Christ's lordship over the Church has cosmic implications and

¹ Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, p. 148 n. 7 summarizes this opinion.

² Käsemann, "Eine urchristliche Taufiturgie"; E. Schweizer, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung*² (ATANT, XXVIII; Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962); and cf. Gabathuler, *op. cit.*, p. 115 n. 674.

³ Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 93, 97.

⁴ Schlier, "κεφαλή," *TWNT*, III, 678; Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 95 n. 2.

⁵ Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 106; cf. Kehl's critique, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-94.

⁶ Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 138-61. Cf. *supra*, p. 46 n. 3.

Church-existence is inseparable from the rest of the universe. As Otto Piper points out:

...In the light of what precedes, the existence of the church can no longer be isolated from the rest of the universe. The same power by which the universe is given unity and a common meaning, manifests itself also in the church. The coming into existence of the church is not an anomaly in history but rather it is the manifestation of a divine operation which is concerned with the whole universe.¹

4. Ἀρχή. The basic meaning of this term is primacy, whether in a temporal sense (Mt. 19 : 4, 8; John 15 : 27; Acts 26 : 4; Heb. 1 : 10; II Pet. 3 : 4; I John 2 : 24; etc.) or with reference to authority and sovereignty (Rom. 8 : 38; I Cor. 15 : 24; Eph. 1 : 21; 6 : 12; Col. 1 : 16; 2 : 10, 15; etc.). When the singular form is applied to Christ in Col. 1 : 18 the emphasis is on priority in order or normative authority, an ἀρχή "durch die alles Geschaffene seine Norm erhalten hat, in die es mit der Erfüllung seines Schöpfungszweckes einmündet."² It is by the resurrection that Christ receives this normative authority, as the immediately following phrase (πρωτότοκος ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν) and the following ἵνα and ὅτι clauses make clear. These two terms taken together imply that Gen. 1 : 1 and 2 : 7 rather than Gen. 1 : 27 are the biblical background, and Christ is the πνεῦμα ζωοποιοῦν (I Cor. 15 : 45) on the basis of his resurrection.³ In Col. 1 : 18 ἀρχή is used differently than in Rev. 3 : 14 (ἀρχή τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ θεοῦ), for the title describes Christ as founder of a new humanity, as in the LXX the founder of a family was designated as the ἀρχή (cf. Gen. 49 : 3; Deut. 21 : 17).⁴ The three terms ἀρχή, πρωτότοκος, and πρωτεύων refer to historical action (cf. γέννηται, εὐδόκησεν, and εἰρηνοποιήσας) rather than to suprahistorical patterning by the divine Wisdom.⁵

¹ Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work," *Interp.*, III (1949), 296.

² Delling, "ἀρχή," *TWNT*, I, 482.

³ Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 80.

⁴ Cf. Acts 3 : 15; 26 : 23; Rev. 1 : 5; Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 97.

⁵ Concerning πρωτεύων, cf. Lohse, *Briefe Kol.*, p. 97 n. 7; Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 103. W. L. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (Cambridge: Univ. of Cambridge Press, 1939), p. 159 held, to the contrary, that "Wisdom" was the "image" of God (an identification indebted to unbiblical distinction between ideal and real worlds such as obtains in Plato, *Timaeus*, 30c; Philo, *De Mund. Op.* 4; and *Corpus Hermeticum* Ascl. 1. 2). Cf. Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964), I, 166ff. C. F. Burney, "Christ as the APXH of Creation," *JTS*, XXVII (1926), 160-77, refers to Epiphanius, *Haer.* II, 73, 7, in support of his assertion that

The relation between creation and redemption is not that of static pattern to copy, according to this hymn, for the relation is a dynamic one in which redemption works within creation (1:18). Christ is the One who, as "head" and "beginning," brings together in himself the dynamic relation between creation and redemption. In that sense his position is one of power and normative authority.¹

5. Πλήρωμα. The problem is whether to understand this word in an active or a passive sense, and the answer given depends largely on the *religionsgeschichtliche* background which is assigned to the concept.² Lightfoot and others have favored the passive meaning ("that which is completed") and have thought that the term is used here in accord with the meaning of the gnostic (Valentinian) technical term.³ Moule, who favors a passive meaning, denies a gnostic origin, however, and supports his translation "God in all his fulness" on the basis of Col. 2:3 and absence of technical meaning in other N.T. occurrences of the term.⁴ Hegermann concludes that no compelling parallels to this term are available.⁵

J. Armitage Robinson replied to Lightfoot, pointing out that the -μα ending did not always have a passive meaning in the Greek usage of that time, and concluded in favor of the active meaning.⁶ Though the word etymologically has a passive sense, it was more frequently used in classical Greek to mean "that which fills or with which a thing is filled," an example being provided in Plato's *Republic*, II, which mentions the inhabitants or population filling a

in Col. 1:16-18 Paul interprets Christ as "the beginning" to which Prov. 8:22 refers, and then provides an elaborate Rabbinic exposition of Gen. 1:1 as referring to Christ.

¹ Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work," p. 297: "Verses 17 and 18a are the bracket that holds together the Son's work in Creation and Redemption." Cf. Schweizer, "Aufnahme und Korrektur jüdischer Sophiatheologie im Neuen Testament," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 110-21.

² In Rom. 13:10, e.g., love may be interpreted either as that which fulfills the law or as the law itself fulfilled. Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 257-73 provides a history of interpretation of the term πλήρωμα.

³ Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 258-60.

⁴ Moule, *op. cit.*, pp. 164-69.

⁵ Hegermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 105-06.

⁶ J. Armitage Robinson, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1903), pp. 255ff. Cf. Mark 2:21. Substantives in -μα not always have a passive sense, but "they give the *result* of the agency of the corresponding verb" (256).

city: πλήρωμα πόλεως.¹ I Cor. 10 : 26, 28 (T.R.), quoting from Psalm 23 : 1 of the Septuagint, speaks of whatever fills the earth or is contained in it as: ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς. Texts in the LXX which use πλήρωμα with an active meaning are: I Chr. 16 : 32; Psalm 23 : 1; 49 : 12; 95 : 11; 97 : 7; Jer. 8 : 16; 29 : 2; Ezekiel 12 : 19; 19 : 7; 30 : 12; 32 : 15.

There appears to be no reason to go beyond a Septuagintal background for this concept, with the result that it is a *nomen actionis* which, in this instance, designates Christ's eschatological power of bringing the creation to its τέλος.² Hymn and context (Col. 2 : 9) use the term in this way, contrasting Christ's work with that of the στοιχεῖα (Col. 2 : 8).³ Kehl's interpretation of ἀποκαταλλάξαι as "die Wiedergutmachung der ἀλλαγὴ von Röm 1, 23," which is convincing, lends support to the active interpretation of πλήρωμα.⁴ The subject of εὐδόκησεν may well be, accordingly, the Spirit of holiness who in the resurrection declared Christ to be Lord (Rom. 1 : 4; Col. 1 : 18).⁵

6. Summary. The multiplication of titles for Christ in this hymn is not in vain, for the kind of parallelism which Paul uses introduces a new meaning with each additional term.⁶ Christ's revelatory work is seen in the εἰκὼν; his ontological work as the ground of being is evident in πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως (Paul having shown Christ's relation to the whole of creation but not having elucidated the ontology of the Trinity); his sovereign work is seen in the ἀρχὴ of 1 : 18; and his redemptive work stands out clearly in 1 : 18-20,

¹ Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1957), p. 678, consider the meaning in Col. 1 : 19, as in 2 : 9, to be the sum total or fulness of something, though they find the active meaning in Mt. 9 : 16; Mk. 6 : 43; I Cor. 10 : 26; I Clement 54 : 3; etc. Cf. *Respublica*, II, 12.

² Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work," p. 297. Cf. Eph. 4 : 10: "He who descended is he who also ascended far above all the heavens, that he might fill all things."

³ Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 119-20.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 160.

⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 120-25. Cf. *supra*, p. 99 n. 4.

⁶ Cf. J. Weiss, *Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897). In Hebrew *parallelismus membrorum*, each member of the parallel expresses the totality of the concept but from a different perspective. Greek *parallelismus membrorum* indicates a new shade of meaning with each additional member of the parallel. Except in biblical quotations, the Hebrew type of parallel is not used by Paul, for his Greek readers would not understand it.

especially in the titles *κεφαλή* and *πλήρωμα*. The relation between creation and redemption, viewed from these various perspectives, always centers in Christ, whose lordship is evident not only in the occurrences of the word *κύριος* (1 : 3, 10; 2 : 6; 3 : 17, 18, 20, 23, 24; 4 : 7, 17; cf. 1 : 2 and 2 : 16), but also in various themes of the epistle, those in the hymn and its immediate context being: "the kingdom of his beloved Son" (1 : 13); "the might of his glory" (1 : 11); "Christ in you, the hope of glory" (1 : 27); and the titles of Christ in the hymn, all of which presuppose his lordship.

The relation between creation and redemption under Christ's lordship is evident in each of the Christological titles of the hymn. In the *εἰκὼν* one sees the rootage of Christ's lordship in history as "the beloved Son" reveals the Father in this world. According to the *πρωτότοκος* concept, God's redemptive purpose is expressed through Christ who rules and through the creation which serves God through him, for this concept refers to priority of authority within the creation. As the *κεφαλή* of the Church, his "body," Christ's lordship has cosmic implications, and shows, for example, that redemption precedes creation and informs it (cf. also Eph. 1 : 4). Because the Lord of the Church is Lord of the cosmic totality, regardless of what transpires in the Church—i.e., because he is *εἰκὼν* and *πρωτότοκος* whether or not he is *κεφαλή* of the Church, for the former are not described as being dependent on the latter—it is clear both that what happens in the Church is not for the sake of the Church alone but for the sake of the entire creation, and that Christ is Lord over the universe whether or not the members of the Church always and in every respect acknowledge his lordship in their own lives. Otherwise stated, Christ's lordship in creation does not depend on his lordship in redemption and his lordship in redemption does not depend on his lordship in creation, for Christ's mediatorship in both respects is dependent on the redemptive purpose of God the Father. Thus, according to the *ἀρχή* concept, the relation between creation and redemption is not static but dynamic, for redemption works within the creation through Christ's position of power and normative authority, which was specified by the resurrection. Finally, the *πλήρωμα* concept shows that Christ is the one who brings content into the potential forms of existence, for it is through him that the "fullness" of their potency is actualized.

E) Background. Käsemann's thesis in favor of the gnostic background of this hymn has already been mentioned. Other scholars

who have contended in favor of a primarily non-Jewish background of Col. 1: 15-20 include J. Weiss, who saw the influence of the Stoic "worldsoul,"¹ and R. Bultmann, who maintains that in Col. 1: 20 and Eph. 1: 10 the "biblical tradition has been forsaken and Gnostic mythology is at work."² Dibelius and Holtzmann saw the influence of Philo's "*Urmensch*," and Cerfaux speaks of an "Alexandrine" background.³

Included in the problem of the background of this hymn are the questions whether the terminology of the hymn was influenced by the Colossian "heresy" which it sought to combat, a suggestion made by Lightfoot and intimated by Calvin,⁴ and whether the Colossian "*Irrlehre*" originated on Jewish or Hellenistic soil. Lightfoot contended that the heresy was rooted in a gnostic type of Judaism which he thought the Essenes represented.⁵ Lohmeyer, who refrains from designating the specific *religionsgeschichtliche* position of the Colossian heresy, finds an "apokalyptische Welt- und Geschichtsbetrachtung" in this hymn, and a combination of the eschatological Son of Man and a cosmological Adam-doctrine.⁶ Masson thinks the literary form is "more Semitic than Greek."⁷ Bornkamm is certain that the Colossian heresy was a type of Jewish Gnosticism which included Iranian-Persian elements and influences

¹ Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910), p. 226. Cf. J. Weiss, *Earliest Christianity*, II (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1959), 465. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*² (London: S.P.C.K., 1962), argues, rather, that Paul's substantial view of the Spirit is explicable in the light of Jewish usage (183), and that Paul, in agreement with the Rabbinic thought of his day, denied cosmic significance to the Spirit (188).

² Bultmann, *Theology*, II, 149.

³ Martin Dibelius, *op. cit.*, p. 8; H. J. Holtzmann, *Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie*, II (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911), 286; Cerfaux, *op. cit.*, p. 400. Cf. Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 69, who argues against interpreting Col. 1: 16 in terms of the Philonic Logos as worldsoul, for according to Philo not everything but only the κόσμος νοητός was created in the Logos, nor is the πάντα of Col. limited to the "*Ideenwelt*."

⁴ John Calvin, *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957), p. 151; J. B. Lightfoot, *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*⁸ (London: Macmillan, 1886), p. 150.

⁵ Lightfoot, *Colossians*, pp. 71-111.

⁶ Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe*, zweite Hälfte, p. 46; cf. p. 40.

⁷ Masson, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

from Chaldean astrology.¹ Moule questions the usefulness of "a rigid contrast between distinctively Jewish and non-Jewish elements," and distinguishes only two indubitably Hellenic elements in Colossians (πρόσις in 2 : 16, ἀφειδίξ σώματος in 2 : 23).² Percy contends that Col. 1 : 20 is based on Pauline presuppositions and should be interpreted in the light of Gal. 3 : 19.³ Against Holtzmann's hypothesis of an opposition between Colossians and the early "*Homologumena*" (cf. I Cor. 15 : 24ff., according to which Christ hands over everything to God, and Phil. 2 : 9-11 which concludes: "to the glory of God the Father"), Percy points out:

In Kol 1, 15ff. ist aber die Hauptangelegenheit des Apostels gerade die Hervorhebung der Überlegenheit Christi über das ganze sonstige Dasein; dabei liegt aber sein Verhältnis zu Gott ganz ausserhalb des Blickfeldes.⁴

According to Schweizer, Col. and Eph. answer the major problem of Hellenistic man, namely that the unity of the cosmos is broken. In the hymn of Col. 1 : 15-20 Christ is understood against two *religionsgeschichtliche* backgrounds: in the language of Wisdom literature, as the Mediator of creation who overcomes the cosmos; and in terms of Greek thought, as the *macroanthropos* who is the Head of the body—i.e., of all.⁵

Though no clear picture of the Colossian "heresy" has been agreed upon, the search for *religionsgeschichtliche* background to the hymn as well as to Colossians continues. Hegermann's thesis is that the Hellenistic synagogue heavily influenced development of Hellenistic Christianity, and he has maintained: that cosmic Christology was

¹ Günther Bornkamm, *Das Ende des Gesetzes* (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, XVI; München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952), pp. 147-53. J. Gewiess, "Die apologetische Methode des Apostels Paulus im Kampf gegen die Irrlehre in Kolossä," *Bibel und Leben*, III (1962), 258-70, thinks that the Colossian error "is basically Jewish with overtones of the pagan astral cult."

² Moule, *Colossians and Philemon*, p. 30. Cf. pp. 29-34, 56, 62.

³ Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 74. Cf. Holtzmann, *op. cit.*, II, 28off. At the same time, Paul thinks that Christ is the divine Wisdom, as a comparison between Col. 1 : 15-27 and Wisdom of Solomon 7 : 25-30 indicates. Cf. Galloway, *The Cosmic Christ* (London: Nisbet, 1951), pp. 52-53; W. L. Knox, *Gentiles*, p. 159.

⁵ Schweizer, "Die Kirche ... Antilegomena," *Neotestamentica*, p. 313. Cf. Schmauch, *Beiheft* to Lohmeyer, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, Kolosser und an Philemon* (K-EKNT, IX; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964), pp. 40-41, for summary of various views concerning the Colossian "philosophy."

influenced both by Hellenistic synagogues and Palestinian-Christian kerygma, that the cosmic terms in the Colossian hymn were borrowed from Philo, that Philo had been influenced by Gnosticism, that the Colossian hymn came at least partly from Hellenistic sources, and that a decision about the Colossian "heresy" is unnecessary.¹ Craddock argues, to the contrary, that Christ's pre-existence is intelligible only on the basis of an *Urmensch* myth that mediated between the Stoic *Allmachtsformel* and Colossian Christology, but Kehl has challenged this on the grounds that both Philo and Wisdom literature, though indebted often to Stoicism, speak of pre-existence without Stoic pantheism and without gnostic *Urmensch* myth.² Feuillet sees technical Alexandrian Wisdom-language in Col. 1 : 16a, according to which Christ is the model used by God for creating the universe, and he supposes that "Prov. 8 : 22 and Col. 1 : 15-16 are inseparable."³ T. F. Glasson, agreeing with E. Schweizer's emphasis on parallels in Wisdom literature, finds in the Old Latin translation of Sirach 24 : 10 a possible parallel to Paul's description of Christ's primacy in Col. 1 : 15, 18 (πρωτεύων and πρωτότοκος).⁴ Lohse finds the characteristics of Wisdom in the Hellenistic synagogue to be the major source for the Christological titles εἰκὼν, πρωτότοκος and ἀρχή.⁵ Longenecker assumes "Jewish Christian agitation behind the difficulties in the Lycus Valley" (which led to angel-worship and loss of Christ's uniqueness), but he thinks that the heresy at Colossae underwent "syncretistic development" during which time the same terms were used by different *Weltanschauungen*, with resultant confusion. "Paul's response to this challenge was the insistence that if one is to think philosophically as well as religiously, then indeed the primacy and priority of Jesus must be asserted in the cosmological sphere as well."⁶ James M. Robinson describes Col. and Eph., on the other hand, as gnostic and post-Pauline, and places Paul "somewhere in the middle of the trajectory from apocalypticism to Gnosticism," both of the latter

¹ Hegermann, *op. cit.*, pp. 2, 93, 110, 130-32, 201.

² Craddock, " 'All Things in Him,' " *NTSt*, 12 (1965), 78-80; Kehl, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

³ Feuillet, *Le Christ Sagesse*, p. 270; cf. Kehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 107-08 n. 25.

⁴ T. F. Glasson, "Colossians I 18, 15 and Sirach XXIV," *NT*, XI (1969), 154-56.

⁵ Lohse, *op. cit.*, p. 84.

⁶ R. N. Longenecker, "Some Distinctive Early Christological Motifs," *NTSt*, 14, (1968), 540; cf. p. 532.

being forms of "loss of world."¹ Col. presents, according to Conzelmann, a "timeless phenomenology of salvation existence."²

It is the merit of Kehl's monograph on the Colossian hymn that it makes use of parallels which clearly lie close at hand (Proverbs, Wisdom, Deuteronomy, Romans) rather than the very uncertain parallels which have been claimed in Philo, Gnosticism and elsewhere. Nothing in this Chapter V would support efforts to make of the Colossian hymn a veritable mosaic of pieces picked up from all directions, and everything in this chapter would agree both with Kehl's impatience with excesses of parallel-hunting, and with Markus Barth's corrective, in turn, of Kehl's anthropocentric reduction:

Above all, the anthropocentric slant which he gives to the utterances on the cosmic rule and peace-work of Christ appears to oversimplify and narrow the meaning of the Pauline text. This reviewer is less sure than K. that all biblical statements about Christ's relation to the universe must pass through the bottleneck of human sin, personal experience of forgiveness, ecclesiastical organization, and sacramental manipulation. It might well be that the danger of a Christmyth crouches as near the door of theologians who make man the measure of all things, as of those who subsume Christ among natural events and corresponding myths. The message of Col still points out that man is faced with a worldwide reconciliation which includes man though he may not yet be aware of it.³

The thought-process of I Cor. 8 : 6, which moved from God and Christ toward both redemption and creation, remains the thought-process of the Colossian hymn and its context.⁴ It is not the case that the author of Colossians took an Hellenistic cosmology and converted it by placing it in a soteriological context. In spite of a strong theological presupposition by some, there is no evidence which says that strophe 1 must be interpreted by strophe 2, or that creation must be interpreted by redemption. Again in this hymn, rather, creation and redemption are both there under Christ's lordship, neither is subordinated to the other, and both are related to one another only through that lordship. It is significant that in the

¹ Robinson, "World" (*supra* p. 100 n. 5), pp. 108-09.

² Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*, 12 (1966), 234.

³ Markus Barth's review in *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 110.

⁴ Significantly Hegermann, *op. cit.*, p. 169, thinks that Paul countered erroneous cosmic speculations at Colossae by referring to the old confession of Christ as creation-Mediator, which is given expression in I Cor. 8 : 6.

christological hymns of Philippians and Colossians the relation between creation and redemption is so much emphasized.

II. EPHESIANS 1:3-14

Though uncertainty about authorship of Ephesians is greater than about any other epistle that has been object of this study, the influence of Paul is sufficient to justify retention of that letter in the *corpus Paulinum*.¹ Cosmic Christology is most evident in the opening thanksgiving, which has been variously described as a Christian meditative hymn (as in Rom. 8:31ff., I Cor. 13) and as a prose liturgical piece not necessarily confined to use in baptism.² In light of the syntax of this thanksgiving we shall concentrate on its important concepts concerning the relation between creation and redemption.³

¹ Cf. *supra*, p. 4 n. 1; p. 93 n. 2; N. A. Dahl, "Adresse und Proömium des Eph.," *TZ*, 7 (1951), 241-64, favoring Paul as author; H. Chadwick, "Die Absicht des Epheserbriefes," *ZNW*, 51 (1960), 145-54, who sees no way to determine authorship; J. C. Kirby, *Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost* (London: S.P.C.K., 1968), Part I of which surveys recent literature on Ephesians, and Kirby concludes that the author, though not Paul, was someone with Jewish background and training (165), for "Eph. has close connections with Jewish liturgical forms and also with Jewish and Christian traditions of Pentecost in the late first century" (149); Ralph P. Martin, "An Epistle in Search of a Life-Setting," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 296-302, who places the *Sitz im Leben* in "a situation when gnosticizing and antinomian tendencies were being felt in the Gentile Churches in Asia Minor" (300), and who suggests the author was Luke, who used Eph. to defend Paul's *heilsgeschichtlich* inclusion of old Israel as the matrix out of which the "one body in Christ" came.

Eduard Schweizer, "Die Kirche also Leib Christi in den Paulinischen Antilegomena," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), pp. 301-09, suggests that the distinctive theology shared by Col., Eph. and I Tim. 3:16 originated "bei Paulus selbst," but it is questionable whether that theology was "die geschichtliche Interpretation einer physisch-kosmischen Erhöhungs-christologie" (306), which latter he maintains.

² R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi* (*SNTMS*, 4; Cambridge: Univ. Pres, 1967), p. 19; R. Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, pp. 66, 75f.

³ E. Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 253 n. 1, describes Eph. 1:3-14 as "das monströseste Satzkonglomerat (denn von einer Periode kann man da gar nicht reden), das mir im griechischer Sprache begegnet ist..." Deichgräber, *op. cit.*, p. 75 describes this long-continuous sentence as vulgar-style Greek, and sees the influence here of a liturgical tradition in Hebrew (non-rabbinic, but more like Qumran). R. P. Medebielle, "Épître aux Colossiens" in Louis Pirot (ed.), *La Sainte Bible*, XII (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951), 26, discusses five possible outlines of the verse, and favors the following: Predestination (1:3-6), Redemption (1:7-10), Vocation (1:11-14). Schlier, *Der Brief an*

A) The theme of Ephesians is the purpose of God through Christ in his Church, as the vocabulary indicates. The number and variety of words that are used in Ephesians to describe God's purpose is impressive. In the first chapter alone the following occur: *θέλημα* (1: 1, 5, 9, 11); *βουλή* (1: 11); *εὐδοκία* (1: 5, 9); *πρόθεσις* (1: 11); *προτίθεμαι* (1: 9); *προορίζω* (1: 5, 11); *ἐκλέγομαι* (1: 4); *κλησίς* (1: 18). It is notable, further, that *Χριστός* occurs forty-six times in Ephesians, ten of these in the first chapter. *Ἐκκλησία*, which is introduced in 1: 22, occurs nine times in Ephesians.¹

Ephesians 1: 3-14 comprises a doxology of praise to the electing God who, as both the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,² is to be praised because of his blessing the author and his readers with every spiritual blessing. After verse 3 provides the opening statement, verses 4-14 document what God's blessings in Christ were, are, and will be.³ The sum of God's blessings in Christ is election

die Epheser (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1957), p. 39, suggests that the benediction in 1: 3 is the basis of the whole eulogy which follows in a dependent clause (1: 4-14), which is introduced by and is built upon, three main verbs: *ἐξελέξατο* (4-6a), *ἐχαρίτωσεν* (6b-7), and *ἐπερίσευσεν* (8-10). Verses 11-14 carry forward in a double strophe of two relative clauses the development of the blessing (40).

¹ Robert Morgenthaler, *Statistik des Neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1948), pp. 93, 156.

² Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, p. 43, comments: "Der Gott und Vater' is fast *ein* Begriff." The problem, discussed from the time of the Church fathers, is whether τοῦ κυρίου is dependent on θεός as well as on πατήρ. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in W. R. Nicoll (ed.), *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, III (London: Hodder & Stoughton, n.d.), 245, says: "Grammar leaves the question open; for the inclusion of θεός and πατήρ under one initial article does not establish" the view that "the God and Father" are bound together, "nor does the use of καὶ instead of τε καὶ disprove it (cf. iv. 6; 1 Pet. ii. 25)." In light of Eph. 1: 17, ὁ θεός τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, it seems probable that Paul intends to say in 1: 3 that the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is also his God. Cf. John 20: 17, and the parallel description ὁ θεός καὶ πατήρ ἡμῶν which occurs in various forms in Gal. 1: 4; 1 Thess. 1: 3; 3: 11, 13.

³ The relation between 1: 3 and 1: 4-14 depends on the interpretation of καθώς. The causal sense of this word is evident ("since, in so far as") in John 17: 2; Romans 1: 28; 1 Cor. 1: 6; 5: 7; Eph. 4: 32; Phil. 1: 7 (cf. Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 392). If καθώς in 1: 4 carries the causal emphasis, the meaning would be that God blessed us because he elected us, etc. In 1 Cor. 1: 6; 5: 7; and in Eph. 4: 32; Phil. 1: 7, there is a possibility, suggested in the context, that not only a causal meaning is intended, but also the idea of "the degree that, as." Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 247, thinks, accordingly, that the meaning is: "according as," 'in conformity with the fact that.' ...Here καθώς designates the ground of the 'blessing,' and so is also the note

(ἐξελέξατο in 1 : 4 being the main verb in 1 : 4-14), an election which destined us in love for God by destining us for sonship through Jesus Christ. At verse 6 there begins a spiral movement as one thought leads to another, circling always around the central themes of God's purpose and the praise of the glory of his grace (κατὰ τὴν εὐδοκίαν τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ in 1 : 5, cf. 8, 11: and εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ in 1 : 6, 12, 14). This entire thought-complex grows out of the one conception of election, whereby God blessed us in Christ: προορίσας (1 : 5) modifies ἐξελέξατο (1 : 4); ἡς ἐχαρίτωσεν (1 : 6) modifies τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (1 : 6), which is part of a prepositional phrase that modifies προορίσας; ἡς ἐπερίσσευσεν (1 : 8) modifies τῆς χάριτος (1 : 7), which is part of a prepositional phrase that modifies the word ἔχομεν in 1 : 7 (itself the main verb in the clause that modifies the ἡγαπημένῳ in 1 : 6, which, in turn, is part of a prepositional phrase that modifies the ἐχαρίτωσεν of 1 : 6); etc. No matter at what point in this long, involved sentence (1 : 3-14) one begins to read, even if he begins at 1 : 9-10, he reads something which is ultimately related through the maze of connections to the ἐξελέξατο, a verb which declares that the ground of God's blessing us is his gracious electing purpose. This purpose, from God's side, is eternal (πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου) and, in all its variety of implications, is directed toward man that he may be ἅγιος καὶ ἀμώμος in the presence of God.

The grace of God which is given expression in "the Beloved" (1 : 16) is to be praised because its fullness includes (1) not only our being destined to sonship by God's having elected us to be holy and blameless before him, but also because (2) his grace includes the revelation to us of the mystery of God's will, a revelation made according to God's "good pleasure," a εὐδοκία which he purposed in Christ with the object of disclosing and accomplishing an all-inclusive plan for the fullness of times—an οἰκονομία, that is, which intends ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ. In Christ, further, "we" Jewish Christians and "you" Gentile Christians were "called out" (repeating in the passive voice the theme expressed in ἐξελέξατο,

of its grandeur. The 'blessing' proceeded on a Divine election, and took effect in accordance with that."

The context of καθὼς in Eph. 1 : 4 may well call for either or both meanings at once, the idea being that God blessed us not only "because" he elected us, but also "to the extent that" he elected us, etc. Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, p. 49, thinks that καθὼς "einen vergleichenden und begründenden Sinn in einem hat."

1:4),¹ with the result that, whether *we* were appointed by the counsel of God's will or *you* were sealed by the Holy Spirit, together we may live "to the praise of his glory." Reconciliation in the Church (1:11-14), accordingly, is parallel to the working of redemption in creation as a whole (1:9-10), and both are works of God's grace (εὐδοκία in 1:9; χάριτος ... ἐπερίσσευσεν in 1:8; ἀπολύτρωσιν in 1:14; etc.).²

The relation between creation and redemption is determined, according to Ephesians 1:3-14, by God's grace through Christ the Lord. In the first place, God's plan for the fullness of the times is set forth ἐν αὐτῷ (1:9), i.e., ἐν τῷ ἡγαπημένῳ (1:6) in whom God expresses his grace according to the various ways indicated by the clauses marked by ἐν ᾧ (1:7, 11, 13a, 13b) and ἐν αὐτῷ (1:9, 10). Second, God's electing purpose preceded the creation (1:4) and, since the conclusion of God's dealings with creation is ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ this electing purpose evidently is the ground not only of the act of creation but also of the preservation of creation until "the fullness of the times." Third, the parallel ἐν αὐτῷ clauses (1:10, 11) indicate that creation and redemption are parallel works of God. The dependence of these clauses on the ἡγαπημένῳ (1:6), in whom God expresses his grace, shows that creation and redemption are works of God's grace. Fourth, the repeated references to Christ are references to One who is "Lord" (1:2, 3, 15, 17, etc.).³ It is through this Christ who is Lord that God determines, by his grace, the relation between creation and redemption. The lordship of Christ, accordingly, is exercised through the dual works of creation and redemption.

B) Is the purpose of God other-worldly? Does redemption ex-

¹ J. A. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

² Käsemann, *Leib und Leib Christi* (BHT, IX; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933), p. 157 (cf. p. 185), mistakenly thinks that, according to Eph. 1, in Christ the Church and creation are identical. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 57, likewise subordinates creation to redemption by asserting that Eph. 1:10 means "the reconstitution of the essential oneness of mankind in Christ as a spiritual community, as it was one in Adam in a physical sense," thereby limiting the meaning of τὰ πάντα.

³ Κύριος occurs 26 times in Ephesians with reference to Jesus Christ. The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ (with its equivalents "in him" and "in whom") occurs 36 times in Ephesians. Beare, *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians* (MNTC; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930), p. 615, says of ἐν Χριστῷ: "It is associated with the initiation, the working out in history, and the final consummation of God's great design in the creation and with every spiritual experience of the Christian believer."

clude creation as indifferent to spiritual existence, does it fight against creation as something which is actively evil in its opposition to God's purpose, or does redemption work in and for creation? Without benefit of the preceding syntactical considerations, such questions could arise at the outset for the reader of such terms as "spiritual blessing," "in the heavenlies," "in Christ," the "summing up again of all things," and the setting forth of a "mystery" which is a "plan" or a "purpose" concerning "things in heaven and things on earth." The next step is to investigate these terms individually to determine what they assert concerning the relation between creation and redemption.

This relation comes to light most clearly in verses 10-11 (which show God's purpose for creation "in him"—1 : 10, and for the redeemed "in him"—1 : 11), and in verses 9-10 (which describe the mystery of the revelation and accomplishment of God's plan for the fulfilling of the times—i.e., the summing up again of all things in him who is "our Lord Jesus Christ"). Since this is the case, one begins with 1 : 9ff., which are the climactic verses of the doxology, and works backward in order to see the full implications of this doxology for the theme of the relation between creation and redemption.

1. Ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι. The extent of the problem which confronts the interpreter of this word is indicated by the catalogue of interpretations compiled by Heinrich Schlier.¹

Four separate difficulties concerning this word are distinguishable: its connection with the preceding context, its etymology and history of usage, the meaning of the prefix ἀνα-, and a decision on which meaning among the many possibilities is more probable in Eph. 1 : 10. Several connections of the word with its context have been postulated: (1) ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι modifies the whole clause which begins with γινώρισας (1 : 9), or (2) it modifies only μυστήριον, or (3) only προέθετο, or (4) it modifies εὐδοκία (the clause ἦν ... καιρῶν being a parenthesis), or (5) it defines more precisely the meaning of the immediately preceding clause.² The latter connection seems preferable, for the modifier and the modified would be close together, thus forming a more natural expression. The idea is, thus, that the

¹ Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, p. 64 n. 3.

² S. D. F. Salmond, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in W. R. Nicoll (ed.), *op. cit.*, III, 260. Schlier, *op. cit.*, p. 62 n. 1, mentions two or three other possibilities.

οἰκονομία (whether "plan" or "enactment" of the plan) is ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι τὰ πάντα ... τῆς γῆς.

Though the context of Eph. 1 : 10 tends to bring into ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι the concept of Christ as the Head, the word derives not from κεφαλή but from κεφάλαιον, a word used in papyri to designate "sums of money" (cf. Acts 22 : 28) or the "chief or main point" (cf. Heb. 8 : 1).¹ Quintillian used the noun ἀνακεφαλαιώσεις to mean *rerum repetitio et congregatio* (VI, 1), and for Aristotle the ἔργον ῥητορικῆς is ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν (*Fragments*, 123). Plato used the noun κεφάλαιον to mean the "chief point" (*Laws*, 643, D), or the "recapitulation" of an argument (*Timaeus*, 26, etc.). The conclusion of Salmond is sustained:

The prevailing idea conveyed by these terms, therefore, appears to be that of a logical, rhetorical, or arithmetical summing up. The subsequent specification of the object of the ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι, however, makes it plain that what is in view here is not a logical or theoretical, but a real or objective summing up.²

The prefix ἀνα- has been understood in various ways: as meaning "again" (Vulgate, Tertullian, Abbott, etc.), or "up" and "over" (Chrysostom, Lightfoot),³ "together,"⁴ etc.⁵ Irenaeus' famous recapitulation theory depends upon an iterative sense of ἀνα-, and underlines the eschatological significance of the word:

Ostendimus enim, quia non tunc coepit Filius Dei, existens semper apud Patrem; sed quando incarnatus est, et homo factus, longam hominum expositionem in seipso recapitulavit, in compendio nobis salutem praestans, ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus.⁶

¹ Moulton and Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949), p. 342. Cf. p. 34.

² Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 261. Cf. Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

³ Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 261; Lightfoot, *Notes*, p. 322; Index of this book.

⁴ D. J. Leahy, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in Orchard *et al.* (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 1121.

⁵ S. Hanson, *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians* (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, XIV; Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1946), pp. 123-24, mentions a few other interpretations of the prefix.

⁶ Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, III, 18, 1 in J. P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus; Series Graeca*, VII (Petit-Montrouge: J.-P. Migne, 1857), 932. Cf. English translation in A. Roberts and J. Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, I (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899), 446; Schlier, "κεφαλή,

If the iterative sense of the prefix is not used to imply a circular view of history, as Irenaeus' interpretation does, it seems wise to combine the meaning "again" with the other major possibility "up," for both ideas meet in the concept of Christ's representative function. Hanson, who suggests this, explains:

Hence ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι is an expression of the cosmic unity in Christ. The universe was comprehended in Christ as its κεφάλαιον: Christ is the sum of the universe. As its representative He is at the same time the totality of all things. The correspondence with Christ being the κεφαλὴ of the Church is evident. In the atonement He represented the world, and restored the original unity of cosmos.¹

It is an attractive feature of this "representative" interpretation that it can assert as a possibility what Origen held to be a necessity, namely, the universal restoration of all souls and all things.²

The decision about the meaning of ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι in Eph. 1:10 cannot be made on the basis of general use of the word, in any case, but must be determined by the main theme of the context of Eph. 1:10 and by the basic meaning of κεφάλαιον. Dibelius rightly concludes that ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι refers not only to humanity but to the cosmic totality.³

2. Ἡ οἰκονομία. There are two basic meanings of οἰκονομία: the act of managing or directing a household, and the arrangement or order or plan which the director follows.⁴ In everyday language the

ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι," *TWNT*, III, 681; Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, I, 9, 2; III, 21, 10; 22, 1; IV, 38, 1; V, 29, 2; Origen, *Comm. on J.* 5:6; J. L. Neve, *A History of Christian Thought*, I (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946), 80; F. H. Borsch, *The Son of Man in Myth and History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967), pp. 402-09.

¹ Hanson, *op. cit.*, p. 126.

² Cf. Origen, *De Principiis*, III, 6, 6; I, 6, 3; II, 8, 4-8; *Contra Celsum*, VI, 26; and his homilies on Psalm 3:1, Jer. 2:3, and Ezekiel 1:13. These references are cited by F. W. Farrar, *Eternal Hope* (London: Macmillan, 1904), pp. 157-59. Cf. the discussion by J. N. D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958), pp. 473-74.

³ Martin Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (HNT, XII; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927), p. 46.

Cf. Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 262. This conclusion concerning meaning differs from the view that Eph. 1:10 refers only to humanity, "i.e., the reconstitution of the essential oneness of mankind in Christ as a spiritual community, as it was one in Adam in a physical sense." So W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, p. 57.

⁴ Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 562. Cf. J. Armitage Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 144-45, who quotes Polybius' use (II, 47, 10) of the word for "actual policy" or "line of action," or in a context which deals with "a broad historical view of the general course of events."

word was used to describe the "care" of a bath, a legal transaction, or a notice of a claim or right of procedure.¹ Magical papyri used the word to describe provisions whereby one would win the help of the heavenly powers.² In *The Martyrdom of Polycarp* 2 : 2 the phrase ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς οἰκονομία refers to "the arrangement or structure of the body beneath the skin; they are laid bare by scourging." Some decades before this writing, Ignatius wrote to the Ephesians that "our God, Jesus the Christ, was conceived in the womb by Mary according to a dispensation" (18 : 2), and he mentioned "the dispensation whereof I have begun to speak, relating to the new man Jesus Christ" (20 : 1).

The question is which of the two basic meanings of the word (household arrangement, or the carrying into effect of a design) is meant in Eph. 1 : 10 and 3 : 9. Luke 16 : 2-4 "shows that it is not always possible to draw a sharp distinction between the office itself and the activities associated with it:"³

And he called him and said to him, 'What is this that I hear about you? Turn in the account of your stewardship, for you can no longer be steward.' And the steward said to himself, 'What shall I do, since my master is taking the stewardship away from me? I am not strong enough to dig, and I am ashamed to beg. I have decided what to do, so that people may receive me into their houses when I am put out of the stewardship.'

The more active, verbal meaning (the carrying out of God's will and good pleasure) is preferred by some scholars,⁴ whereas the more passive meaning (the *Heilsplan* which discloses the mystery of God's will) is preferred by others.⁵

It seems well to accept both meanings of the word, since either of the major meanings of οἰκονομία may be supported by the context of Eph. 1 : 10, and since either meaning is in accord with Paul's

¹ Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 442.

² O. Michel, "οἰκονομία," *TWNT*, V, 154-55.

³ Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 562.

⁴ T. K. Abbott, *Ephesians and Colossians (ICC)*, p. 17; F. W. Beare, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in G. A. Buttrick (ed.), *The Interpreter's Bible*, X (Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), 619-20; J. A. Robinson, *op. cit.*, pp. 32, 144-45; Schlier, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64; and H. von Soden, *Der Brief an die Epheser (Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament, III)*, Freiburg I. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1891, p. 105.

⁵ Eadie, *Ephesians*, pp. 51 f.; D. J. Leahy, "The Epistle to the Ephesians," in Orchard *et al.* (eds.), *op. cit.*, p. 1121; and Percy, *op. cit.*, p. 270.

theology as a whole. What God has purposed in Christ is his εὐδοκία whereby he made known to us the mystery of his will. The objective was both the enactment or accomplishment of his will and the revelation of the structured orderliness of his plan, a plan in which each καιρός has its place pointing toward τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν (cf. Gal. 4 : 4). The latter meaning ("plan") emphasizes the foundation of God's work for the Ephesians in his past election of them, and brings to mind πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου (1 : 4), προορίσας (1 : 5), and the past tenses of the verbs ἐξελέξατο (1 : 4), ἐχαρίτωσεν (1 : 6), ἐπερίσσευσεν (1 : 8), προέθετο (1 : 9), προηλπικότητας (1 : 12), and ἐσφραγίσθητε (1 : 13). The systematic arrangement which characterizes the οἰκονομία τοῦ πληρώματος τῶν καιρῶν is evident in the past history of God's gracious election (cf. I Cor. 2 : 7; Gal. 3 : 22ff., 4 : 2, 4; Rom. 5 : 6, 20f.; II Tim. 1 : 10). This interpretation of οἰκονομία has nothing to do with a dispensationalist view, however, as Markus Barth has shown.¹

If the passive meaning of οἰκονομία as "plan" refers to the past, the active meaning (enactment of the plan) looks primarily to God's present and future action in Christ to bring all καιροί to their πλήρωμα. God's purpose, ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι ... τῆς γῆς (1 : 10), has not been fully realized. For that reason, God purposed in Christ not only a new revelation of this eternal purpose, but also the out-working of that purpose in history. This interpretation of οἰκονομία brings to mind the future meaning in the context: εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἁγίους καὶ ἀμώμους κατενώπιον αὐτοῦ (1 : 4), εἰς υἰοθεσίαν (1 : 5), εἰς ἔπαινον δόξης τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (1 : 6; cf. 1 : 12, 14), ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν, εἰς ἀπολύτρωσιν τῆς περιποιήσεως (1 : 14). In Christ we are shown "the manner in which the purpose of God is being worked out in human history."² This active meaning of οἰκονομία, says Abbott, "is founded on the conception of the Church as God's household" (cf. I Tim. 3 : 5; Heb. 10 : 21; I Peter 4 : 17; Eph. 2 : 19).³ It is not only because of God's revelation in Christ of the eternal mystery of his will, as Schlier thinks, that the fullness of times has come, but also because in Christ the actions of God, by which he accomplishes the purpose of all times, assert the divine

¹ Markus Barth, "Conversion and Conversation: Israel and the Church in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians," *Interp.*, XVII (1963), 15.

² J. A. Robinson, *op. cit.*, p. 145.

³ Abbott, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

lordship over all times.¹ God's redemptive purpose is at work in the *καίροι* with the intention that not only "we" but also *τὰ πάντα* shall be "in Christ."

3. *Τὸ μυστήριον*. The contention of Bousset, Reitzenstein and others that Paul's "Christ-mysticism" was indebted to contemporary mystery religions, is not tenable for several reasons: (1) union with Christ meant incorporation into a community, whereas the mysteries appear to have been individualistic; (2) the gods of the mysteries were not rooted in history as was the Jesus who was the Christ; (3) union with Christ, for Paul, did not mean absorption into the divine; (4) dying and rising with Christ was not achieved by celebration of outward rites such as baptism or the eucharist; (5) nor has the attempt succeeded to show the dependence of much of Paul's language on the Mysteries.² The very term "mystery" is not a gnostic term, but is "a specifically Jewish conception, being indeed an essential factor in apocalyptic writing, which consists in the revelation of eschatological secrets and of the heavenly world,

¹ Schlier, *op. cit.*, p. 64. Cf. Beare, *op. cit.*, p. 619; Cullmann, *Christ and Time* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950), p. 33, pp. 91-92.

² Bousset, *Kyrios Christos* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1921); Reitzenstein, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*³ (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927). Cf. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 88-110, who discusses various interpretations of Paul's Christ-mysticism: (1) Paul was influenced directly by the mystery religions; (2) the view that Paul did not adopt "the Hellenistic outlook" in exchange for his Jewish inheritance (Edwyn Bevan, H. A. A. Kennedy, A. D. Nock, A. E. J. Rawlinson, C. A. A. Scott, etc.); (3) the theory that the synagogues of Hellenistic Judaism had become centers of the mysteries (E. R. Goodenough); (4) Albert Schweitzer's view of the apocalyptic conception of the solidarity of the elect with the Messiah; and Davies' conclusion that Paul was the herald "not of a new mystery but of a new Exodus."

Cf. S. Angus, *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity* (New York: Scribner's, 1925). A mystery religion is described as a system of religious symbolism, a religion of redemption, a secret gnosis, a sacramental drama which appealed primarily to the emotions, an eschatological religion, a religion of personal obligation rather than of duty to the state, and a cosmic religion (47-75). Extended bibliographies of both ancient and modern sources are provided at the end of the book.

Carl Clemen, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912), concludes that "the New Testament *ideas* that are *perhaps* derived from non-Jewish sources—for we may emphasize once more the hypothetical nature of most of our results—lie mainly on the fringe of Christianity, and do not touch its vital essence" (372).

Bruce M. Metzger, "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLVIII

and is the true speculative theology of Judaism at the time of Christ."¹

The circumstance that there are twenty-one occurrences of τὸ μυστήριον in Pauline literature, but in the gospels only the occurrence in Mark 4:11 par. ("to you is given the mystery of the Kingdom of God"), need not be attributed to Paul's indebtedness to the mystery religions. That τὸ μυστήριον was a technical religious term, "applied in secular Greek (predominantly plural) mostly to the mysteries with their secret teachings," is certain,² but it was also used by the Dead Sea sect.

Especially in the late 1950's-1960's scholarship has brought to light parallels between Qumran and not only the Pauline concept of "mystery" but also the letter to the Ephesians. Though the Christology of the latter has no parallel in Qumran material, K. G. Kuhn sees sufficient stylistic parallels to warrant the conclusion: "So ist die Schlussfolgerung eines *Traditionszusammenhanges* des Epheserbriefes mit den Qumrantexten in Sprache und Stil kaum zu umgehen."³ Franz Mussner, citing 1QS 4:18-19, 1QS 11:5-6, 1QpHab 7:13, and 1QH 1:21, lists motifs which are shared in common between the "mystery-doctrine" of the Scrolls and the teaching concerning "mystery" in Ephesians. In both cases the mysteries, hitherto hidden in God, are eschatological in nature. Yet, Ephesians mentions "mystery" only in the singular and means by it specifically the eschatological reign of Christ.⁴ Joseph Coppens argues not only that Qumran shows that the μυστήριον comes from Jewish (apocalyptic and especially sapiential) background, but also that the distinction between the concept of "mystery" in Colossians

(1955), 1-20, concludes: "...if a judgment may be hazarded, the central doctrines and rites of the primitive Church appear to lack genetic continuity with those of antecedent and contemporary pagan cults" (20).

¹ Daniélou, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity*, p. 365; cf. pp. 365-69. Gnosticism is indebted to this Jewish Christian gnosis, as in the *Odes of Solomon* 6:5; 7:28; 8:9-11; etc. (368-69). Cf. Dupont, *Gnosis*, pp. 38-39; W. D. Davies, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Origins," *Christian Origins and Judaism*, p. 107.

² Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 531. Bornkamm, "μυστήριον," *TWNT*, IV, 810, shows that the etymology of the word is uncertain.

³ Kuhn, "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte," *NTSt*, 7 (1961), 337. Cf. Schlier, *op. cit.*, p. 61 n. 1; Kirby, *op. cit.*, p. 160.

⁴ Mussner, "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran* (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968), pp. 159-63.

and in Ephesians should not be too sharply drawn (cf. Col. 1 : 26-27; Eph. 3 : 19; 4 : 13), even while one may recognize some development from Colossians to Ephesians.¹

Qumran as well as the Mysteries emphasized knowledge for the "initiates."² The meaning in Ephesians, as in the New Testament generally, is quite different, however, for the "mystery" is not to be kept hidden. Rom. 11 : 25; 16 : 25f.; I Cor. 2 : 6-10; Col. 1 : 26f. agree that the mystery has been revealed and is to be proclaimed.³

In Ephesians the content of the mystery is eschatological in nature, as in Rom. 11 : 25.⁴ The beneficiaries of the mystery are designated as "saints," "faithful ones" (Eph. 1 : 1), or "perfect" (I Cor. 2 : 6; Col. 2 : 25-29; Eph. 4 : 13), but not as "those initiated." Though not all Christians were considered capable of understanding all of the mysteries, especially speaking in tongues (I Cor. 14 : 2), "the mystery" of which Ephesians speaks is a mystery with cosmic implications, and which has been "made known to us" without exception. Whether the mystery is of God (1 : 9) or of Christ (3 : 4) or of the gospel (6 : 19), it is the acceptance of Gentiles as Christians (3 : 3ff.; 3 : 9ff.), which is part of the "plan for the fullness of time, to unite all things in him..." (1 : 10).⁵

The main point is that the Christian *μυστήριον* is not removed from this world in the esoteric manner of mystery religions, but is

¹ Coppens, " 'Mystery' in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran," in Murphy-O'Connor, *op. cit.*, pp. 148-56.

² Quotations from papyri illustrate the Mysteries. Cf. Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 420.

³ Cf. the discussion of I. Cor. 2 by W. D. Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *Christian Origins and Judaism*, p. 172. Cf. the discussion of "the revelation of the mystery of Christ" by Cerfaux, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, pp. 402-18.

⁴ Bornkamm, " *μυστήριον*," *TWNT*, IV, 829.

⁵ Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 532. Eph. 5 : 32 refers to an unique mystery which concerns the relation between Christ and the Church. Cf. Knox, *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, pp. 183f., 227f.

Percy, *op. cit.*, pp. 379-82, discusses the meaning of *μυστήριον* in Eph. and Col., and contends, against Dibelius (*op. cit.*, p. 64), that in Col. 1 : 27 as in Eph. 3 : 6 the mystery concerns the participation of the heathen in salvation. In both Col. and Eph., however, the mystery is not confined to the inclusion of the heathen in salvation: "...der Kern des Heilsgeheimnisses ist vielmehr Christus selbst als Vermittler des Heils durch seinen Tod und seine Auferstehung; das Teilhaben der Heiden am Heil ist nur eine, wenn auch eine wesentliche Seite dieses Geheimnisses" (381). The context of Eph. 3 : 6 determines the meaning of *μυστήριον* in that verse (381). Eph. 1 : 9-10 shows the cosmic implications of the *μυστήριον*.

related decisively to καιροί, to τὰ ἐπὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (1 : 10). The content of this mystery is more than the acceptance of Gentiles as Christians (3 : 3ff., 9ff.), for this acceptance is part of God's purpose for the entirety of creation (1 : 10). This μυστήριον concerns the οἰκονομία which expresses God's "good pleasure" and which brings God's redemptive purpose into dynamic contact with the creation. If there is a Christian "mystery," according to Ephesians, it is a mystery about this world rather than some other world, for it concerns the fulfillment of the meaning of human history (πλήρωμα τῶν καιρῶν) and the unity of "things in heaven and in earth." There is no opposition between creation and the redemptive purpose, no subordination of creation to a redeemed or "spiritual" existence, but the interaction between creation and redemption "in him" who is "our Lord Jesus Christ."

4. Ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ. Since everything which is said in 1 : 4-14 is dependent, through the καθὼς in 1 : 4, upon 1 : 3, it is important for the interpretation of all that follows to understand the adverbial phrases which modify ὁ εὐλογήσας and which describe how God once blessed us (cf. Aorist) in Christ. There are three of these phrases, each introduced by the preposition ἐν. It is possible that each phrase expresses a local meaning, but more probable, "in view of the following ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις," that ἐν ... πνευματικῇ expresses the means of God's blessing.¹ 1 Thess. 4 : 18; James 3 : 9; Mt. 5 : 13; 7 : 2, also use ἐν to express means.

Interpretation of the means whereby God blesses us depends on what interpretation is given to πνευματικός. An adjective with an -ικός ending indicates relation to something or a state of "belonging to" or being concerned with something.² The occurrences of πνευματικός may be classified according to five meanings: a subjective meaning which refers to the human spirit as indwelt by the Holy

¹ S. D. F. Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 246. Blass and Debrunner, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-18 (cf. p. 104), say concerning "instrumental ἐν": "The use of ἐν owes its extension especially to the imitation of Hebrew constructions with אֲנִי."

² Blass and Debrunner, *op. cit.*, p. 62. A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*³ (New York: George H. Doran, 1919), p. 158, illustrates the meaning of the suffix -ικός as follows: "Σαρκ-ικός (from σάρξ, Arist., Plut., LXX) is a man who lives according to the flesh and is here opposed to those who are πνευματικοί (from πνεῦμα, from Arist. down, but not in LXX, pertaining to the wind). But ὁ ψυχ-ικός (from ψυχή, Arist., Polyb., down) is the man possessed of more natural life (1 Cor. 2 : 14) as opposed to regenerate (πνευματ-ικός) life (1 Cor. 2 : 15). Σαρκ-ικός can be applied to either of these two distinct classes."

Spirit (I Cor. 2 : 14; 15 : 44, 46); an objective meaning which refers to the Spirit of God (Rom. 1 : 11; I Cor. 12 : 1); a mixed usage (subjective and objective) applied to persons (I Cor. 2 : 13; 3 : 1); a mixed usage applied to things (the law is spiritual—Rom. 7 : 14; knowledge and understanding are spiritual—Col. 1 : 9; songs are spiritual—Col. 3 : 16 and Eph. 5 : 19); and special uses in Eph. 6 : 12 and Rev. 11 : 8. Ephesians 1 : 3 fits the fourth category and reflects “an experience of the strengthening and sanctifying power of the Spirit in the lives of the members of the church which made the word ‘spiritual’ a natural one to use.”¹

That is, if God’s means of blessing us are described as *πνευματικοί*, this description does not imply opposition against this world or man’s bodily nature or physical matter, but rather utilization of man’s whole being that he may serve God in the Spirit. In the words of Heinrich Schlier:

Ist die εὐλογία πνευματική als der Segen, den der Geist in sich beschliesst, bewirkt und erschliesst, zu verstehen, dann ist es klar, dass es sich nicht um den Gegensatz eines ‘materiellen’ und ‘geistigen’ Segens handelt, dass aber auch nicht an einen Segen gedacht ist, der in Geistesgaben oder Charismen besteht, sondern daran, dass dieser Segen das Pneuma ist, sofern er in der Kraft des Pneumas über ‘uns’ gekommen ist.²

If in Rom. 7 : 14 the νόμος is *πνευματικός* because it is νόμος θεοῦ and “proceeds not from man’s world, but from God’s,” so in Eph. 1 : 3 the εὐλογία, with which God blessed us, is *πνευματικός* because it comes from God through the Spirit.³ God blesses us with that which belongs to the supranatural order of being.⁴ If in pre-Socratic Greek *πνευματικός* was used “mostly in the sense ‘pertaining to the wind

¹ E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* (London: Macmillan, 1947), p. 284. Cf. pp. 283–85. Selwyn’s first category is clarified by the comment in Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 685 on I Cor. 2 : 14 that the ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος “is a person who has nothing more than an ordinary human soul” whereas ὁ πνευματικός (ἄνθρωπος – understood) “possesses the divine πνεῦμα, not beside his natural human soul, but in place of it; this enables him to penetrate the divine mysteries.”

² Heinrich Schlier, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, p. 44.

³ Eduard Schweizer, *Spirit of God (Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel’s Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, IX; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960), p. 88.*

⁴ Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 685, observe that in I Cor. 15 : 44a (cf. 44b) the resurrection body is a σῶμα πνευματικόν, and in II Clement 14 : 1–3 the pre-existent Church is πνευματική as “that which belongs to the supernatural order of being.”

or breath,' " in the New Testament the meaning of the word remains closely tied to the Spirit of God.¹ But it is the work of the Spirit not to separate man's soul and body, but to make them work together for God's glory (cf. Rom. 12 : 1; I Cor. 6 : 20). The circumstance that a blessing is "spiritual" because it is sourced in Christ through the Spirit does not mean, accordingly, that such a blessing is removed from this world. The way in which God blesses those whom he has chosen serves, rather, his purpose to sum up again all things in Christ and contributes to the accomplishment of his plan for the fullness of time. As in 1 : 9ff., so in this phrase, ἐν πάσῃ εὐλογίᾳ πνευματικῇ, it is clear that God's redemptive purpose is at work within the creation, so that creation and redemption are not separated but brought together.²

5. Ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις. This phrase occurs in the New Testament only in Ephesians (1 : 3, 20; 2 : 6; 3 : 10; 6 : 12). In 1 : 20, 2 : 6 (cf. Ps. 110 : 1), 3 : 10, and possibly in 6 : 12, the meaning is local. Though this fact does not necessarily determine the meaning in 1 : 3, it lends weight to the interpretation of this phrase in 1 : 3 as conveying a local meaning. According to Phil. 3 : 20, the Christian's commonwealth is "in heaven," clearly a local meaning. Though Chrysostom, Luther, *et al.* interpret this phrase in Eph. 1 : 3 as referring to "things" (as though this phrase were "a more definite characterization of the spiritual blessings"), the ancient Syriac translation, Jerome, Beza, Bengel, Eadie, *et al.* think the phrase conveys a local meaning which describes the realm in which the

¹ *Ibid.* Though this is no place for full discussion of πνεῦμα in Pauline literature, cf. W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 221ff., 352; Davies, "Paul and the Dead Sea Scrolls: Flesh and Spirit," *Christian Origins and Judaism*, discussion of physical and moral connotations of σὰρξ (pp. 153ff.), and incidences of Paul's use of the term πνεῦμα (pp. 171-72).

² Cf. E. G. Selwyn, *I Peter*, p. 284: "Once the term 'spiritual' became a normal one to use of the mature Christians and the settled Christian community, its extension to the things which entered into their spiritual life was not likely long to be delayed: their hymns, their thought, their religious blessings generally were all entitled to the word, if they were part of their religious life or served its purpose."

The discussion by R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, I, 232-39, of the distinctions between "flesh," "in the flesh," and "according to the flesh," as these terms were used by Paul, shows that in Pauline thought "flesh" and "spirit" are not always opposed for "flesh" may mean simply man's physical being or the field or sphere of his daily life. In this respect the thought of Eph. is in agreement with Pauline thought.

spiritual blessings are located.¹ Use of the plural substantive form, τὰ ἐπουράνια, to convey a local meaning ("things in heaven") reaches back to Plato in the fourth century B.C. The word was still so used by Sextus Empiricus in the second century A.D.² There is no usage of ἐπουράνιος in the Septuagint "except as an epithet of θεός in two passages in III Maccabees."³

The next question is whether this probably local meaning is to be interpreted literally or figuratively, and in what figurative sense. S. D. F. Salmond interprets ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις as describing the spiritual blessings further "as being found in heaven. To that they belong, and from thence it is that they come to us to be our present possession on earth."⁴ Unless a three-decker view of the universe is adopted, however, according to which heaven is "up there" (cf. Eph. 4 : 9-10), this quasi-literal meaning must also be resolved into a figurative one. The value of Salmond's interpretation is its reminder of the "otherness" of τὰ ἐπουράνια from man's existence in this world.

Lightfoot emphasizes, on the other hand, the immanence of God's blessings: "The heaven of which the Apostle here speaks is not *some*

¹ John Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*² (New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1861), pp. 15-16. Eadie cites only the authors, but not their works. Traub, "ἐπουράνιος," in Kittel and Friedrich (eds.), *op. cit.*, V, 539-40, favors the local meaning in Eph. 1 : 3 because that is its meaning in Phil. 3 : 20, IV Macc. 17 : 5, Ps. 110 : 1, and in the rest of Ephesians. Robertson and Davis (eds.), *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*¹⁰ (New York: Harper and Bros., 1933), p. 255, declare that context determines the meaning of ἐν. "Note the three examples of ἐν in John 2 : 23, one of place ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις, two of time ἐν τῷ πάσχα ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ at the passover at the feast."

² Arndt and Gingrich, *op. cit.*, p. 306. According to Moulton and Milligan, *op. cit.*, p. 252, the word was used already by Homer and there are examples of its use in the Paris magical papyrus 574 in A.D. third century. Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (1927), pp. 255-63, provides photographs of folio 33 of the "Great Magical Papyrus" (A.D. 300), along with an editing of the Greek text and an English translation. The word ἐπεουράνιον (= ἐπουράνιον) occurs in line 3042. Deissmann comments: "In spite of the resemblance to Phil. ii. 10, Eph. ii. 2, iii. 10, vi. 12, this is not a quotation from St. Paul. The papyrus and St. Paul are both using familiar Jewish categories" (261, footnote 10).

³ R. M. Pope, "Studies in Pauline Vocabulary: Of the Heavenly Places," *ET*, XXIII (1912), 365. Pope does not cite the references. Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, I (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897), 539, cite III Mac. 6 : 28; 7 : 6.

⁴ Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

remote locality, some *future abode*, it is the heaven which lies within and about the true Christian."¹ Such an interpretation of Eph. 1 : 3 is in defiance, however, of the same phrase in Eph. 6 : 12. In these two passages one sees the "two extreme poles" of the one spiritual situation, which the author describes by the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, as Hugo Odeberg has contended:

In the first passage the Church is said to possess every spiritual blessing in Christ in the ἐπουρανίοις, in the last it is pictured as *in the ἐπουρανίοις* being involved in a conflict of war with cosmical and evil *spiritual* powers of that realm. Spiritual blessing and cosmical and spiritual warfare are the consequences of the Church being ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις.²

Existence ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is existence within the realm where Christ is, wherever his lordship is exercised. This phrase does not describe, therefore, a part of the universe in distinction from the earth, nor is any systematic schematization of parts of the universe evident in Ephesians,³ but the reality which is described by the phrase is not restricted to individual Christians, for the Church makes known God's wisdom "in the heavenlies" (3 : 10) and is in combat against certain powers of evil "in the heavenlies" (6 : 12).⁴

It seems justified to say that, though heaven is not a place, τὰ ἐπουράνια has a figuratively local meaning which describes analogically the reality of heaven. Eph. 2 : 2 and 6 : 12 show that there are, in the words of Traub, "*zwei verschiedene Vorstellungswelten*."⁵ Eph. 4 : 9f. and 3 : 10, in addition, use the phrase ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις in

¹ Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1957), p. 312.

² Hugo Odeberg, *The View of the Universe in the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd 29. Nr. 6; Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1934), p. 13.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 20: "The *Weltbild* of Ephesians may be summed up in the motto: ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ χωρὶς Χριστοῦ, ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ, Χριστὸς ὁ τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσιν πληροῦμενος."

⁴ Cf. the unsatisfactory attempts of Pope, *op. cit.*, p. 366, to interpret the meaning of Eph. by reference to Plato's *idea* and Kant's noumena (though for the author of Eph. "in the heavenlies" is not "noumenal" in distinction from "phenomenal"); and of Schlier, *op. cit.*, pp. 46-47, to interpret the transcendence of "the heavenlies" by use of the term "die Himmel des Daseins" and by asserting that the purpose of this heaven is to call man to decision (though existence ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις is not, for Eph., merely subjective or individual existence within a "*Lebensraum*," within which man is to decide for or against Christ's lordship).

⁵ Traub, "ἐπουράνιος," *TWNT*, V, 540.

order to place "*die kosmische Bedeutung des Offenbarungsgeschehnisses in den Vordergrund.*"¹ Christians are surrounded by unseen powers which work their way into this world, but which originate ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις (6 : 12), the result being that Christians must fight against some powers in heaven. Ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις refers, thus, not to "blessings laid up for our future enjoyment in the heavenly life (e.g., Th. Aquin.)," but to blessings which are ours now not only because they originated in heaven but because these blessings "have their *seat* where God Himself is and where Christ reigns."²

The significance of heaven is that it is the "place" where God's throne is (cf. Psalm 2 : 4; 11 : 4; etc.), or the source of his sovereign rule. The blessing with which God blessed us is ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις because it originates at the source of his sovereignty and, when given to us, continues to express to us his sovereignty. Wherever these blessings may find us, accordingly, they are still ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις—not as though heaven were in us or about us, but because heaven, as a reality which is a-spatial, is directly concerned with us here and now. Even "when we were dead through our trespasses," ἡμᾶς ... συνεκάθισεν ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (Eph. 2 : 6), and Christ Jesus who was raised from the dead is interceding for us in heaven (Rom. 8 : 34; cf. Heb. 4 : 14).³ That heaven is only figuratively a "locality" is evident in the fact that while we live in this spatial world, God places us "in the heavenly (realities)," which are to be found where Christ Jesus is.

Because ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις does not refer to a specific, literal locale but, rather, to the "realm" of God's sovereignty, and since this sovereignty is exercised over the cosmic totality (according to Ephesians), and since those who live in this world and are "chosen" by God are placed simultaneously ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις, it is clear that this phrase bears witness, in its context, to the redemptive purpose

¹ *Ibid.*

² Salmond, *op. cit.*, p. 247. Since the Hebrew word used for heaven occurs only in the plural, שָׁמַיִם, the plural form of οὐρανός is common in the LXX and New Testament (cf. Deut. 10 : 14; I Kings 8 : 27; Nehemiah 9 : 6; Psalm 148 : 4; II Cor. 12 : 1ff.; Eph. 4 : 10; Heb. 4 : 14).

³ Ernst Percy, *Die Probleme*, p. 182, is in partial agreement with the idea "dass ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις einen feierlicheren Klang als ἐν τοῖς οὐρανίοις habe und deshalb besser dem liturgisch erhabenen Stil des Epheserbriefesentspreche." He comments, however, that the term indicates not so much a place "als eine Lebenssphäre mit allem dem, was in ihr eingeschlossen ist" (182-83). Cf. Martin Dibelius, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (HNT, XII; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1937), p. 45.

of God at work in this world. To be "chosen" by this redeeming God is not to be placed in another world, nor removed from the evil of this one, but is to be blessed with the presence of the sovereign God in this world. God's blessing those whom he has chosen ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις causes no rift between creation and redemption but is rather an act which shows the unity between his work of creation and his work of redemption. This blessing in past history and the election "before the foundation of the world" are both "in Christ," who is designated as "Lord," the one who "sits" at the "place" of God's sovereignty—"at his right hand in the heavenly places."

6. Ἐν Χριστῷ. It has been debated in an extensive body of literature whether this formula has only a local meaning (Deissmann), primarily an instrumental meaning (Büchsel, Bouttier), or no definite meaning (Blass and Debrunner).¹ As a formula closely connected with the phrase "in the Spirit," ἐν Χριστῷ expresses, according to Deissmann, "the most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ," and transforms the "historical" Christ into a present reality.² Büchsel objects that the spatial analogy raises the question how Christ can also dwell in us, as Paul claims.³ Büchsel also supposes, along with Blass and Debrunner, that since ἐν Χριστῷ is used in such different contexts, its meaning is not self-contained but is derivative in each case from its context.⁴ The difficulty of the formula is further complicated by problems concerning each of its two words, for ἐν is to be compared with διὰ and σύν, and Χριστός is to be related to other titles, especially κύριος.⁵

It is probable that as the title Χριστός came originally from Judaism, so did the Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ formula depend primarily on usage in the LXX, as Dom François Gerritzen has suggested in

¹ Blass and Debrunner, *op. cit.*, p. 118: "The phrase ἐν χριστῷ (κυρίῳ), which is copiously appended by Paul to the most varied concepts, utterly defies definite interpretation."

² Adolf Deissmann, *Paul, a Study in Social and Religious History*² (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 143.

³ F. Büchsel, " 'In Christus' bei Paulus," *ZNW*, 42 (1949), 141-58.

⁴ *Ibid.* Also M. Bouttier, *En Christ. Étude d'exégèse et de théologie pauliniennes (Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 54; Paris: Presses Univ. de France, 1962), favors the instrumental meaning.

⁵ Helpful for both problems is the discussion in Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (SBT, 50; London: SCM, 1966), pp. 141-50.

his useful survey of scholarship on this formula. The concept of incorporation of many in the Head (e.g.: Gen. 12 : 3, *Καὶ ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς*; and Gen. 21 : 12, *Ἐν Ἰσαάκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα*) may not be "strictly local" in meaning, but it is more than merely instrumental, and it is probably the idea of incorporation that ἐν Χριστῷ carries.¹ While the formula conveys changes of emphasis according to different contextual usages, "there is still a firm nucleus of meaning at its base," as Conzelmann contends.²

It is primarily a spatial analogy that the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ provides, but not in the individualistic sense of Deissmann, for it is a corporate concept. To be "in Christ" is to be part of a new humanity of which he is the Head, and is to be ingathered into the true Israel of God.³ Death-and-resurrection with Christ is both a personal (Gal. 2 : 20; Phil. 3 : 10) and corporate (Rom. 6 : 5; 8 : 17; II Cor. 1 : 5f.) experience. Albert Schweitzer corrects Deissmann's spatial interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ, according to which Paul's "Christ-mysticism" is comparable with the "God-mysticism" of Hellenism, by rooting Paul's conception in "the preordained union of those who are elect to the Messianic Kingdom with one another and with the Messiah which is called the 'community of the Saints.'"⁴

In Ephesians this phrase describes not only a relation which is deeply personal and concretely social, but also implies a particular relation between all those who are "in Christ" and the cosmic totality. The phrase occurs in two significant ways in Eph. 1 : 3-10: not only has God within history blessed us "in Christ," but God has also within history set forth his purpose "in Christ" to sum up again all things "in him." God's revelation to those whom he has chosen is in accord with his plan for all the creation, a plan which is being

¹ Gerritzen, "Le sens et l'origine de l'EN ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ paulinien," *Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, volumen secundum (Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus 1961; Rome, 1963), p. 331.

² Conzelmann, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 211. Conzelmann rightly corrects (212) the argument of F. Neugebauer, "Das Paulinische 'In Christo,'" *NTSt*, 4 (1957), 124-38, that "in Christ" expresses indicative, but "in the Lord" its resulting imperative.

³ Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, pp. 86ff.

⁴ Albert Schweitzer, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (New York: Henry Holt, 1931), p. 101. Cf. pp. 6, 15, 18ff., 33-36. Schweitzer has been criticized, however, for ascribing to Paul the "magical" idea that union with Christ happens mechanically at baptism. Cf. W. D. Davies, *op. cit.*, pp. 98-99.

enacted in Christ for all that God has created. Further, according to Eph. 1 : 22, this same Christ is made "head over all things for the church." If in Col. 1 : 17 the "beloved Son" is the one in whom "all things hold together," in Eph. 1 : 10 "Christ" is the one in whom God works to sum up all things again. To live "in Christ," then, is to live in the one in whom all the universe is held together. To be in the church is to be in his body, "the fullness of him who fills all in all" (Eph. 1 : 23). To live in Christ is to participate in this redemptive "filling" of all creatures with their true being and real meaning.

III. SURVEY OF EVIDENCE

The conclusion toward which the last three exegetical chapters point is that Pauline thought began with the lordship of Christ and in that light saw the relation between creation and redemption.

One does not find in Pauline epistles a one-way movement of thought from creation to redemption or from redemption to creation, for the link between the creation and God's redemptive purpose is provided in Christ's lordship. It is not the case that Pauline thought started with a phenomenological survey of this world in order to relate the creation to God's redemptive purpose, nor did Paul's thought begin with introspective investigation of the subjective experience of one's personal redemption and then attempt to "universalize" this inner experience, nor did Paul deduce cosmic Christology from the Church's experience of redemption. The link between creation and redemption had been given, rather, in the lordship of Jesus the Messiah, and was already being confessed in the Church before Paul, so that the relation between creation and redemption needed only to be explicated by Paul in various concrete situations. Cosmic Christology underwent development during the course of this explication, to be sure, but it is the agreement between various levels of development and the continuities in this motif which need to be underscored at this juncture of Pauline studies.¹

¹ The Col. hymn, along with Col. 2 : 19, goes beyond I Cor. 8 : 6 by speaking of the reconciliation of the cosmic powers in Christ. In so doing, however, the hymn is in implicit agreement with Rom. 8 : 38f. and it does not contradict the idea expressed in I Cor. 15 : 24 of destruction of the hostile power of the powers.

The Phil. hymn includes Hellenistic elements that are later than the confession in I Cor. 8 : 6, and important items of the Jerusalem kerygma

The evidence on which this conclusion is based, and which was provided in those texts which explicitly develop the theme of the relation between creation and redemption, may now be briefly summarized.¹

The "cosmic liturgy" of Rom. 8 : 19ff. assures Christians that present suffering will be consummated in glory, for the Lord within them is Lord over the creation with the result that nothing can separate them from "the love of God that is in Christ Jesus our Lord" (8 : 39). The liberty of Christians within the cosmic totality, especially evident in their deliverance from domination by the powers of evil, becomes evidence, in turn, that the universe is destined to be under Christ's lordship. Frustration and meaninglessness are not intended by God to be the final destiny of his creation.

The Adam-Christ analogy of Rom. 5 : 12-21 and I Cor. 15 : 21ff., 45ff. implies, as Paul's use of it makes clear, an intrinsic connection between the creation of man and the redemption of man. Paul

(cf. I Cor. 15 : 3-5) are absent. Jewish Hellenism, such as is evident in Stephen's speech (Acts 7), provides terminological links with the Phil. hymn. It is also evident that the motif of pre-existence is more developed in the Col. hymn than in the Phil. hymn.

The evidence cannot be pressed, on the other hand, into a simple line of Christological development. The Col. hymn refers to the same confession of faith that is found in I Cor. 8 : 6. There is much in common between II Cor. 8 : 9 and Phil. 2 : 6ff., as also between I Cor. 8 : 6 and Col. 1 : 15-20. The motif of pre-existence was present before the Col. hymn. Ephesians was probably written by someone with strong Jewish influence. Features of early Jewish Christianity include the descent-ascent motif of the Phil. hymn, as well as use of "the Name" and the extension of categories of religious primacy to cosmic supremacy. The three strata of New Testament Christology that have been suggested by Hahn and Fuller appear, then, to be too clear-cut oversimplifications. It is not apparent that the gentile mission stepped beyond functional to ontic statements about Christ or that ontological implications may not be found earlier than at the gentile mission stage even though these implications may not have been in the consciousness of the earlier writers.

Cf. *inter alia* : Conzelmann, *Outline*, pp. 201f., 341; Craddock, *Pre-existence*, pp. 94-99; Feuillet, "L'hymne christologique de l'épître aux Philippiens (II, 6-11)," *RB*, LXXII (1965), 498-99; R. Fuller, *The Foundations of New Testament Christology* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965), pp. 243-57; F. Hahn, *Christologische Hoheitstitel* (*FRLANT*, 83; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963); Hegermann, *Schöpfungsmittler*, pp. 119f., 135, 169; Kirby, *Ephesians*, pp. 38-40, 165ff.; R. Longenecker, "Some Distinctive Early Christological Motifs," *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 536, 540-42; R. P. Martin, *Carmen Christi*, pp. 298 n. 3, 318.

¹ Cf. summaries *supra*, pp. 57-58, 89-90, 108-109.

thinks not only of the implications of Christ's lordship for Christian man, but also for man as man. While maintaining the distinction between soteriology and anthropology, the emphasis of this text is on the continuum between Christ and all humanity—i.e., the anthropological factor in the relation between creation and redemption. Paul finds man's true nature in Christ.

The early Christian confession in I Cor. 8:6 shows that the development of cosmic Christology does not need to be explained by reference to stimulus from Gentile Hellenism. Paul's use of this confession in an hortatory section demonstrates, further, that cosmic Christology assisted in making pragmatic decisions. Knowledge of Jesus' lordship required that the Corinthians become instruments of God's redemptive purpose in the world. According to this confession, the works of creation and redemption are dual functions, in differentiation yet in unity, of the one lordship of Jesus Christ, this lordship having been so structured by God the Father. Not only the occurrence of the term *κύριος* but also Jesus' pre-existence, which is implied in the *διὰ* clauses, point to the concept of Jesus' lordship. For Paul whatever cosmic realities exist are subject ultimately to the lordship of Jesus Christ, for his lordship is not limited to those who acknowledge it. The confession does not distinguish between Creator and Redeemer, for Christ is mediator of both creation and redemption, but rather distinguishes between the source and goal of creation and redemption on the one hand, and the mediator of creation and redemption on the other. According to this confession, with which Paul agrees, theological thought moves from God, the source and goal of creation, and from Jesus Christ the Lord, through whom God's works of creation and redemption are accomplished, toward both creation and redemption.

The Philippian *carmen Christi* proclaims Christ's lordship over all cosmic forces, and in so doing ministers to the Philippians' needs. Being "in the form of God," Jesus makes God manifest in this world and, in so doing, fulfills man's destiny to glorify God. Further, only by "taking the form of a servant" was Jesus "in the form of God," so that the divine splendour was made manifest only in deepest identification with man. Subsequent exaltation of this Servant-Lord is for the purpose of enabling the creation to confess Christ's lordship to the glory of God the Father. Implicitly man's sinful "dominion" is ended by this Lord. The Church's confession of faith is made also on behalf of the creation. The servant form of Jesus' lordship

guarantees that though the creation is not the source of redemption, yet it is the place within which the redemptive purpose is consummated. The relation between God and the world comes to a focal point in the history, from humiliation to exaltation, of the one who is made to be Lord over all things, and under whom the Philippians are to carry forward God's redemptive purpose in this world.

The second Christological hymn, Col. 1: 15-20, describes even more directly the relation between creation and redemption, doing so through the several descriptions of "the beloved Son," and by showing the relation between Christ and creation (1: 15-17), the relation between Christ and the Church (1: 18), and by showing that Creator and Redeemer are one (1: 19-20). Christ is "sovereign" (πρωτότοκος) in both creation (1: 15) and redemption (1: 18). Creation and redemption meet in him, creation serving God's purpose and redemption working within the creation for its restoration and preservation. The cosmic totality (τὰ πάντα) holds together in Him who has the eschatological power (as πλήρωμα) to bring the creation to its τέλος. Especially in these two Christological hymns it is clear that the link between creation and redemption is Christology.

According to Eph. 1: 3-14, it is God's grace through Christ the Lord which determines the relation between creation and redemption. God's redemptive purpose was at work in Jesus before the creation of the world, and it is in this same Jesus as Lord that God wills to sum up again all things. In this epistle, whose main theme is God's purpose through Christ in his Church, to be "in Christ" is to be a member of the body of One who is at work in all creation to bring all things to their fulfillment. If God "has made known to us" the μυστήριον of the summing up again of all things in Christ, the implication is that he made this known in order that we may participate with him in this cosmic mission, and as much is stated in Eph. 3: 8-10: "To me, though I am the very least of all the saints, this grace was given, to preach to the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ, and to make all men see what is the plan of the mystery hidden for ages in God who created all things; that through the church the manifold wisdom of God might now be made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places." The unsearchable riches of Christ embrace the relation between God's redemptive purpose and the entire cosmos.

How does Pauline thought understand the creation of man? Not by analysis of the human situation nor of writings contemporary to

the author(s) of that literature, but by beginning with the central reality of the Christian life, namely Jesus' lordship, and finding there the answer to the questions who man is and for what end he was created. How does Pauline thought understand the creation of the world in which man lives? Not by surveying the surrounding world for clues about the meaning of man's environment in the universe, but by first seeing how Jesus' lordship is related to this world. How does the Pauline literature understand the relation between the total creation, of which man is a part, and the redemptive purpose of God which was at work in the earthly man Jesus? Not by any one movement of thought, as from creation to redemption (the way, for example, of the later *theologia naturalis*) or from redemption to creation (the way, for example, of singular emphasis on justification by faith), but by seeing that the interaction between creation and redemption takes place as a result of Jesus' lordship, for that lordship expresses the continuity of God's sovereignty in the multiple forms of his works of creation and redemption.

CHAPTER SIX

THE LORD OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION ACCORDING TO PAULINE THEOLOGY

It remains to bring together and relate to other Pauline texts the motifs that were common in the three levels of exegeted material, namely: Paul's own writing, tradition and his use of it, and the use of tradition that was made either by Paul or by someone in "the school of Paul." What follows is also the beginning of a bridge from exegesis to exposition in the last quarter of the twentieth century. That there are many perils in such bridge-building, and that there may be other equally legitimate or conceivably better ways of doing so, is granted. The present study was undertaken, however, with no mere antiquarian interest, but because the relation between creation and redemption is of such importance to contemporary life and has been so problematical in recent theology.

The following synthetic sketch of Pauline motifs about the relation between creation and redemption presupposes the preceding five chapters and states the results of this study in four theses, namely: God's redemptive action presupposes the creation, includes the creation, and is undertaken in face of the reality of evil, which latter cannot prevail because of Jesus' lordship through his mediation in the works of creation and redemption.¹

I. THE PRESUPPOSITION OF CREATION BY REDEMPTION

Without ever identifying the creation with the state of redemption, without interpreting God's redemptive purpose on the basis of man's "Fall," and without adopting speculative cosmology, Pauline

¹ Implicit in this chapter are contrasts that have been observed in previous chapters between Pauline thought about the relation between creation and redemption and, on the other hand, gnostic, Hellenistic, mythic and other thought-worlds, as well as efforts to subordinate creation to redemption or to set creation and redemption in opposition to one another. Concerning the latter efforts, cf. J. G. Gibbs, "Interpretations of the Relation between Creation and Redemption," *SJT*, 21 (1968), 1-12.

thought asserts that God's redemptive action presupposes his work of creation.

A) This is not to say that creation and redemption are the same thing, for the act of creation was only the beginning of the carrying out of God's redemptive purpose (cf. Rom. 5 : 14, Col. 1 : 15). The Adam-Christ relation implies that there is an intrinsic relation between the creation and redemption, the connection being one of dynamic ontology (Rom. 5 : 12-21). The concept of the subjection of the creation in hope (Rom. 8 : 20) says as much explicitly, as do also the phrase in Eph. 1 : 10, "the plan for the fulness of the times," and the clauses in Colossians 1 : τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (1 : 17), ἵνα γένηται ἐν πᾶσιν αὐτὸς πρωτεύων (1 : 18), and καὶ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀποκαταλλάξαι τὰ πάντα εἰς αὐτόν (1 : 20). In agreement with the witness of the first creation story in Genesis (1 : 31) to the fitness (טוב, "good") of the world to serve God's purpose, the author of I Timothy expresses a similar view: "For everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving..." (4 : 4).¹

Redemption presupposes the creation in the sense that, by creating the world through Christ, God prepared the room in which redemption was to be fulfilled. As Adam is "the type of the Coming One," the creation of man points toward man's redemption. The *imago dei*, according to Paul as according to the Old Testament, is not some quality within man's being, but the relation of a man to the will of God as he is a part of the *Gemeinde* dedicated to God (Rom. 5 : 12-21).² Redemption does not belong to the creation, for the redemption of the creation depends on the lordship of Christ over the creation, a lordship which was established by God's raising Jesus from the dead (Rom. 1 : 4), though it was implied in Christ's mediating work in the act of creation.

B) Since redemption presupposes the creation under the lordship of Christ, redemption is no after-thought of the Fall. If God chose us in him before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1 : 3), redemption is not the reflex of a God who was caught by surprise when sin

¹ Referring to the relation between creation and covenant, Karl Barth, *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III/1 (Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947), 50, rightly maintains that the act of creation as such "nur um die Ermöglichung und in keiner Weise um die Verwirklichung jenes andern göttlichen Werkes handeln kann."

² Alfred Bloom, "Human Rights in Israel's Thought," *Interp*, VIII (1954), 425.

entered the world. If he, "from" whom are all things, is "Father" (I Cor. 8 : 6), his redemptive purpose was evident already in the act of creation. Colossians 1 : 18-20 makes clear that "the Son's work in creation is what it is in view of the coming redemption."¹ Redemption is not an appendix to the work of creation, nor is it implied in the creation (a pantheistic notion), for the relation between God and the world is not one of cause (unmoved Mover) and effect (change, flux, life). Rather, through the Son God brings the world into being (creates), sustains (cf. Col. 1 : 17, συνέστηκεν) the relation between Creator and creature, and brings it back to himself (Phil. 2 : 9-11). The relation between the creation and redemption is determined by God's grace (Eph. 1 : 3ff.) and is not contingent upon the Fall. Since this is the case, Paul can stress the continuity between man and Christ, a continuity which remains intact in spite of sin (Rom. 5 : 12-21).

C) Having started with Christ, Pauline literature moves to other statements in the Old Testament, not to speculative cosmology, in order to show the unity of God's purpose in the dual work of creation and redemption as revealed in Jesus Christ. The phrase κατὰ τὰς γράφας (Rom. 1 : 2; I Cor. 15 : 3, 4) states that Christ's activity is in accord with the purpose of God disclosed in the Old Testament—both as Christ acts in his human freedom (Phil. 2 : 6-8) and as he is an instrument of God (Phil. 2 : 9-11). The mediatorship of Christ in creation was not asserted on the basis of contemporary Gentile Hellenistic speculation, though that cosmic work was described in some terms which were common in Gentile Hellenism, for his cosmic work was regarded, rather, as an unavoidable implication of his being Lord, and his work in creation was explicated in the light of Israel's faith in the Creator-God.

Pauline passages which relate creation and redemption do so with reference, usually obvious and conscious, to Old Testament texts, among them being: Rom. 5 : 12ff. (Gen. 2 : 17; 3 : 19); Rom. 8 : 20 (Gen. 3 : 17-19; Eccles. 1 : 2-3); I Cor. 8 : 6 (Deut. 6 : 4; Mal. 2 : 10); Eph. 1 : 3 (Gen. 12 : 3; 21 : 12; Psalm 2 : 4; 11 : 4; etc.); Eph. 1 : 20 (Ps. 110 : 1); Eph. 1 : 22 (Ps. 8 : 6); Phil. 2 : 6 (Gen. 3 : 5); Phil. 2 : 7 (Is. 53 : 3, 11-12); Phil. 2 : 10-11 (Is. 45 : 23); Col. 1 : 13, 15 (Zech. 12 : 10-13 : 7—LXX); Col. 1 : 17 (Prov. 8 : 25-27). Pauline thought neither begins nor ends, accordingly,

¹ Otto Piper, "The Saviour's Eternal Work," *Interp.*, III (1949), 290.

with a speculative or philosophical *Weltanschauung* when it expounds the mediatorship of Christ in creation, but begins with the eternal purpose of God which was at work within Israel and is now made manifest in Jesus the Messiah. Cosmic Christology is not a dispensable accretion to earlier essential gospel, but was implicit, for Paul, from the designation of Jesus as Lord through the resurrection (Rom. 1 : 4; Phil. 2 : 9ff.; Eph. 1 : 20-22; Col. 1 : 18-20). Redemption presupposes creation because redemption is no threat to the creation but, rather, carries to fulfillment what was provided as possibility in the creation.

II. REDEMPTION'S INCLUSION OF THE CREATION

Because it is the nature of the Creator not to let his creation go, because redemption deals not only with justification of the individual but with the whole life of humanity in this world, and because the basis of redemption is not man's need but Christ's lordship, Pauline thought maintains that God's redemptive activity includes the creation. It is the lordship of Christ over both creation and redemption which determines that there can be no creationless redemption (Rom. 8 : 18ff., etc.) and ultimately no redemptionless creation (Eph. 1 : 10; Col. 1 : 20; etc.).

A) The meaning of redemption is that God will not let his creation go. This is particularly clear in Romans 8 : 21, which declares that the creation will be brought into the freedom of the glory of the children of God. Paul has no concern for man's soul alone apart from "the redemption of our bodies" (Rom. 8 : 23). Christians do not await release from their bodies, but the release of their bodies, the freeing of the *σῶμα* from the *σάρξ*. The relation of Christ to time shows that there is no neutral time, for time does not exist in a vacuum, but always in the context of God's electing grace and under the lordship of Christ (Eph. 1 : 9-10, Gal. 4 : 4; cf. Titus 1 : 3, Mark 1 : 15). All creation is summed up by God in Christ (Eph. 1 : 10) and reconciled to God through him (Col. 1 : 20), for in Christ "all things hold together" (Col. 1 : 17).

It is equally true that the creation is essential to God's redemptive purpose and that this purpose is essential to creation. The repetition of *πᾶς* and the emphasis on the totality of creation which is provided by the three-fold division of the universe, all in the same sentence which concludes with the word "Father" (Phil. 2 : 9-11), show that

"the glory of God the Father" depends on the confession throughout creation that Jesus Christ is Lord. In this sense the creation is essential to redemption. According to I Cor. 8 : 6 the link between ἐξ and εἰς is διὰ. That is, the mediatorial work of "one Lord, Jesus Christ" is indispensable if that which originated from God "the Father" will continue to exist for him or develop in the direction of his purpose. In this sense redemption is essential to the creation.

It is in the light of the above texts that Paul's two references to καινῇ κτίσει must be interpreted (II Cor. 5 : 17; Gal. 6 : 15), rather than restricting the former texts to the soteriology of the latter.¹ The element of contrast in Paul's eschatology of a new creation is evident in the terms of comparison between Adam and Christ and between the works of Adam and the works of Christ (Rom. 5 : 12-21); in the theme of waiting in Rom. 8 : 19-23; in the implication of Eph. 1 : 10 and Col. 1 : 20 that creation at present is not united with, nor reconciled to, God; and in the implication of Phil. 2 : 9-11 that not yet does every knee bow and every tongue confess the lordship of Jesus Christ. In all these cases, the contrast carries with it the continuity between the former state of creation and the new condition of creation, a continuity which shows that God will not let his creation go. Though creation and new creation are distinguishable, as are secular and sacred, "these two cannot be separated from one another as different 'realms.'"²

B) Redemption includes the creation because it deals with man's whole life in its concreteness in this world. The ktisiological sections of Romans 8 rely, for example, on the axiomatic solidarity between irrational creation and man in order to show that man's pilgrimage from suffering to glory is not an illusion since, according to revelation (8 : 18), there is an eschatological tension in creation which, in the light of the coming of Christ (ἔρχε τοῦ νῦν, 8 : 22), points to "the glorious liberty of the children of God" (8 : 21). The analogy between the creation of the world and the creation of the Church (Eph. 1 : 3-14, Col. 1 : 15-20), for another example, implies a

¹ Roy A. Harrisville, "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament, *JBL*, LXXIV (1955), 69-79, concludes that the concept is dynamic. Adolf Schlatter, *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*² (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1952), pp. 269ff.; and Emil Brunner, *Revelation and Reason* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946), p. 72 n. 16, mistakenly restrict to man any hope for a new creation.

² W. Dantine, "Creation and Redemption: Attempt at a Theological Interpretation in the Light of the Contemporary Understanding of the World," *SJT*, XVIII (1965), 139.

unity of purpose by God within and for this world.¹ The *κενώσις* of the Servant-Lord is further evidence that redemption does more than merely touch the creation tangentially (Phil. 2 : 6-11). It is because the lordship of Christ is so intimately bound up with the form of the servant that the Christian knows that redemption aims to bring the creation back under that lordship. At the center of the creation is the *εἰκὼν* who reveals perfectly the unity of the creation and redemption (Col. 1 : 15; cf. Rom. 5 : 12-21). The Christian "mystery" is the meeting of the creation and redemption in the *οἰκονομία* which expresses God's "good pleasure" (Eph. 1 : 9-10). To be blessed with "spiritual blessings" (Eph. 1 : 3) does not mean that the body is neglected, for the Spirit makes soul and body work together for God's glory (Rom. 12 : 1; I Cor. 6 : 20; etc.).

The Pauline view of the way redemption includes the creation by working actively within it is especially evident in his ethics, according to which creation "is not in itself the final norm and it is not evil," for Paul is "persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is unclean in itself" (Rom. 14 : 14; cf. I Tim. 4 : 4).² According to Eph. 5 : 21-33, redemption includes the creation in the sense that the marriage of man and wife is based on the relation between Christ and his Church. According to Romans 12-15, the redemptive purpose of God works in all of life to make it a service of God in the state, in the Church, and in interpersonal relations.

C) The basis of redemption is not man's need but the character of God as expressed in Christ's lordship. The relation between Creator and creature cannot be squeezed through the bottleneck of justification by faith, for the latter is neither the beginning nor the end of God's ways. Redemption includes the creation not merely for man's sake, but because the cosmic totality itself, as the *gloriae dei theatrum* (Calvin; *Institutes*, I. vi. 2, I. xiv. 20, etc.; cf. Rom. 8 : 19ff., Phil. 2 : 9-11; etc.), was created to glorify God.

Paul's insight that redemption includes the creation depends upon looking to Jesus Christ who is the *τέλος* of God's redemptive will (cf. Rom. 6 : 22-23; 10 : 4; I Cor. 15 : 24), and toward whom (*εἰς αὐτόν*) God brings all creation. Paul sees that redemption includes creation, also, by observing the unity between the Lord and

¹ N. A. Dahl, "Christ, Creation, and the Church," in Davies and Daube (eds.), *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology* (Cambridge: University Press, 1956), pp. 433ff.

² Foerster, "Κτίζω," *TWNT*, III, 1032.

God's self-revelations in the Old Testament. But the content of that inclusion, what this inclusion means for man and for the glory of God, is something which Paul sees primarily in the light of Christ's lordship. It is in the lordship of Christ that Paul sees creation as it was meant to be, a creation which corresponds to the redemptive purpose of God (cf. Rom. 5 : 14; II Cor. 3 : 18, etc.). It is the "filling" power of the *πλήρωμα* which makes each creature and all creation to be what God's purpose destines them to be (Col. 1 : 19; Eph. 4 : 10).

III. THE REALITY OF EVIL UNDER JESUS' LORDSHIP

The Pauline doctrine of the relation between creation and redemption takes seriously the reality and extent of evil as an obstruction to the mediating lordship of Christ, whether in creation, in the Church, or in the interaction between creation and redemption (Rom. 1 : 18ff.; 5 : 6, 9, 12-14, 18-21; 7 : 21-23; 8 : 20, 22-23, 38-39; I Cor. 5 : 5; Eph. 2 : 2; 6 : 10-20; Phil. 2 : 3, 8, 15; 3 : 2ff.; Col. 1 : 13, 21, 24; 2 : 8, 15, 20; 3 : 5ff.; I Thess. 2 : 18; 5 : 3-10; etc.).¹ The cosmic activity of evil is part of Paul's dynamic view of the lordship of Christ in creation and redemption. Accordingly, evil is not anthropocentric, nor is man capable of overcoming evil, nor even of recognizing fully the dimensions of it.

A) The lordship of Christ in creation and redemption makes clear that evil is not anthropocentric. Even though Pauline literature speaks specifically of Christ's victorious death in conquest of the cosmic powers only once (Col. 2 : 15), the motif of conflict is strong in Pauline literature, and there is more in the motif of triumph than is expressible in moral categories. There are a number of antitheses in Romans 5-8, such as righteousness-sin, grace-law, life-death, spirit-flesh, and this section of Romans concludes amid "indications of the idea of a cosmic lawsuit" (Rom. 8 : 31-39).² In various ways

¹ A. M. Hunter, *Interpreting Paul's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954), pp. 74-76. Rom. 12 : 6, I Cor. 12, and Eph. 4 : 11-16 show the interaction between creation and redemption, for God's redemptive purpose uses whatever types of personality and individual endowment are available in creation. These texts presuppose, further, that the divisive force of evil tries to prevent God's redemptive purpose from establishing order, concord, or unity within the diversities of creation.

² R. Leivestad, *Christ the Conqueror: Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament* (London: S.P.C.K., 1954), p. 260. Leivestad wrongly attrib-

Paul shows that evil is not only within man but also outside him, and that the strength of evil in this world is greater than the sum-total which human sin has wrought.¹ Man's problem is not merely within himself, but involves the world and, beyond that, "principalities and powers" and "spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places" (Eph. 6 : 12). There is a "dominion of darkness" (Col. 1 : 13), a "spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2 : 2), and "I see in my members another law at war with the law of my mind and making me captive to the law of sin which dwells in my members" (Rom. 7 : 23).

The Pauline view of the reality of evil is underlined in the doctrine of the cosmic powers, which operate destructively in spite of having been created to serve God's purpose. The powers were created in, through, and for Christ (Col. 1 : 16). The similarity between statements about the law and statements about the cosmic powers shows that "the elemental spirits have a positive function in creation" (Gal. 2 : 19 and Col. 2 : 20; Gal. 3 : 23 and Gal. 4 : 3, 8f.; Gal. 3 : 24 and Gal. 4 : 2; Rom. 8 : 3 and Gal. 4 : 9).² In spite of the circumstance that the cosmic powers are the "invisible background" or "underpinnings" of creation which, because they were created through Christ, are subservient to God's love, however, they have become bound up with sin with the result that "by holding the world together, they hold it away from God, not close to Him."³ Καταργήσῃ in I Cor. 15 : 24 refers not to the abolition or destruction of the cosmic powers but to their dethronement and their being rendered ineffective to the extent that they oppose Christ's lordship, the implication being that they will have a role also in the age to come. Pauline references to the cosmic powers make clear, in any

utes to Paul, however, a pantheistic eschatology (307) and the notion that everything which exists outside God is evil (308).

¹ Cf. Piper, *Erlösung als Erfahrung* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932), p. 26. A. D. Galloway, *The Cosmic Christ* (London: Nisbet and Co., 1951), pp. 210ff., remains anthropocentric in outlook when he maintains that "the central problem which the doctrine of cosmic redemption must solve is that of the suffering arising out of the impersonal nature of man's environment" (231).

² Leivestad, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

³ H. Berkhof, *Christ and the Powers* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1962), pp. 22-24. According to Martin Dibelius, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1909), p. 205, only if Jesus' κενώσεις was related to the world of spirits can His ascension be a victory over the *Geisterwelt*. In this sense, Pauline religion is not mythology, but a living and personally experienced faith.

case, that, for Pauline thought, evil is cosmic in scope and can be dealt with only by the cosmic lordship of Christ.

B) The lordship of Christ in creation and redemption implies, further, that it is not in man's power successfully to resist or overcome evil. Evil can be hated and good held fast only by those who "serve the Lord" within the "one body in Christ" (Rom. 12 : 3-11). According to Eph. 6 : 10ff., one can confront the variety and extent of evil and, indeed, keep alert to stand against evil only by standing in the strength of the Lord, with the whole armor of God, and under the discipline of Word and prayer in the Spirit. The reality of evil is so subtle, "for even Satan disguises himself as an angel of light" (II Cor. 11 : 14), that apart from "a sincere and pure devotion to Christ" even Christians will be led astray (11 : 3). The divisions and factions which break out among Christians even at the Lord's table and which cause their communing to be a coming together "not for the better but for the worse" (I Cor. 11 : 17-20) can be overcome only by "discerning the body" (11 : 29), in which the "varieties of gifts" serve "the common good" under the appointment of God, and in which the suffering or honoring of one member means the suffering or rejoicing of all (I Cor. 12). Man is vulnerable to the power and cunning of evil not only in interpersonal relations and in the structures and orders of society, but also in his relation to, and use or misuse of, nature and natural resources, as the allusion of Rom. 8 : 20 to Gen. 3 : 17 and the allusion of Rom. 8 : 22 to Jer. 12 : 4, 11 make clear. It is not the resistance of man, then, but the coming of the Lord which unmasks the true character of evil as divisiveness, deception, delusion, lawlessness (II Thess. 2 : 1-12). Over against this evil which enslaves man (Rom. 6 : 6; 7 : 23) "the beloved Son" brings to man the kingdom whose order is based on "redemption, the forgiveness of sins" (Col. 1 : 13-14) and whose extent is indicated in the circumstance that in the Lord of this kingdom "all things hold together" (1 : 17).

C) Recognition of the reality of evil depends, for Paul, on the experience within the Church of the reality of Christ's lordship (Gal. 4 : 8f., etc.). Because Christ was Mediator in creation, there is no cosmic dualism. There is an intrinsic connection between the two ages (Rom. 5 : 12-21) because Christ is the "coming One" of whom Adam was the type.¹ The fact that all things are held together in

¹ Anders Nygren, *Commentary on Romans* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949), emphasizes the contrast between the two aeons to the neglect

him who is "the Son of his love" (Col. 1 : 13, 17) is the foundation on which one stands in order to see the world as a "dominion of darkness" (1 : 13) which would disintegrate were it not in spite of itself and from the outside held together. Evil is alien to the creation, therefore, even while universal within it. "Chaos is not the proper being of the world."¹ The world has been subjected to futility, but not without hope (Rom. 8 : 20). If there is now a dominion of darkness, this dominion was no part of God's purpose when "all things were created through him and for him" (Col. 1 : 16).

As it is the law which makes sin known (Rom. 7 : 7), so it is the lordship of Christ which discloses the extent of evil. According to I Cor. 2 : 7-8, "none of the rulers of this age" understood the hidden wisdom of God, "for if they had, they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." According to Col. 2 : 15, it is the triumph of Christ (or God in Christ) over the principalities and powers which brings into public view their true nature. Correspondingly, it is through the Church, according to Eph. 3 : 10, that the wisdom of God is "made known to the principalities and powers in the heavenly places."

IV. THE LORDSHIP OF JESUS AS MEDIATOR OF CREATION AND REDEMPTION

Pauline thought about the relation between creation and redemption builds on the twofold foundation of Church tradition concerning, and Paul's experience of, Jesus' lordship. This thought is marked both by its pragmatic usage and its Christological progress.

A) The Pauline doctrine of the relation between creation and redemption is a major instance of thinking through the implications of earliest Christology and hence of making Christological progress.

Some rather startling statements about Jesus in relation to the cosmos are made in the Pauline literature: all things, we Christians included, exist through the one Lord, Jesus Christ (I Cor. 8 : 6);

of their inner continuity. According to Eduard Schweizer, "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den Paulinischen Antilegomena," *Neotestamentica* (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963), p. 310, late Judaism used the Adam figure more and more to distinguish its view of evil from that of Hellenism, the Hebraic view being that evil is due to sin rather than to creatureliness.

¹ Piper, *Erlösung als Erfahrung*, p. 28.

since Adam was "a type of the one who was to come," the righteousness of the one man Jesus "leads to acquittal and life for all men" (Rom. 5 : 18); the assurance that our suffering with Christ will end in glory with him depends on the certainty that nothing "in all creation" is capable of separating us Christians from "the love of God in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8 : 12-39); God has exalted this Jesus, "that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, in heaven and on earth and under the earth" (Phil. 2 : 9-11); the invisible God is "imaged" by Jesus, in and through and for this Jesus all things were created, in him God placed the capacity of bringing to fulfillment all the potential in creation, "by the blood of his cross" all things can be reconciled to Jesus (Col. 1 : 15-20); in Christ God is at work for the fullness of time (Eph. 1 : 9-10); etc.

The conclusion to which this study has been pressed, namely that Pauline thought begins with the lordship of Jesus, with the result that it sees the relation between creation and redemption, is not surprising in light of three facts, namely: the importance for Paul's theology of his conversion-experience of the risen Lord, Paul's preference for the κύριος title as designation for Jesus, and the prominence of the concept of Jesus' lordship in early παράδοσις. Though it has been beyond the scope of this research to discuss the Damascus Road experience, it cannot be contested that Paul's communion with Christ is rooted in that experience. Paul's certainty that God had elected him was dependent primarily on his conversion (Gal. 1 : 11-16; Acts 9).¹ His understanding of the Church (Head-Body imagery) is indebted to Jesus the Lord's identification with his Church (Acts 9 : 4; 22 : 7; 26 : 14), which occurred on the Damascus Road. The distinction was carefully kept between tradition about Jesus which was handed down to him through the Church (I Cor. 15 : 3) and the gospel which "came through a revelation of Jesus Christ" (Gal. 1 : 12). Only when speaking of his

¹ Cf. J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology," *ET*, LXXXVI (1964), 27-30. The conclusion seems justified that it is unlikely that Paul's conversion was preceded by a long process of inner conflict because of: the explicit statement of Acts 26 : 9, the meaning of ὥφθη as an objective happening rather than subjective vision, the lack of evidence in favor of psychologizing "goads," the presence of conflict in Paul's Christian life as reflected elsewhere in Paul's letters in addition to Romans 7, the fact that all Paul's own emphasis indicates that the conversion was from his side wholly unexpected and came to him from God as entirely new and objective.

conversion did Paul use the expression ὁ κύριός μου rather than ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν (Phil. 3 : 8; cf. Acts 22 : 3-21; 26 : 4-23).

Whether the κύριος title that Paul used in his spontaneous answer on the Damascus Road was then used merely as a respectful title of address, it is clear that from that moment Paul's attention was claimed by the fact of Jesus' sovereignty, so much so that the title κύριος became a favorite designation of Jesus. Ὁ κύριος occurs 16 times in Romans, 44 in I Cor., 17 in II Cor., 2 in Gal., 16 in Eph., 10 in Philippians, 10 in Col., 11 in I Thess., 7 in II Thess., 2 in Philemon. "Our Lord Jesus Christ" occurs 28 times, "the Lord Jesus Christ" 18 times, "our Lord" once.¹

Examination of Pauline usage of the title κύριος discloses: that this title is reserved for Jesus Christ (though used for God in Old Testament references), that the title does not refer specifically to Jesus' earthly life, that the title does refer to Jesus' death and resurrection (Gal. 6 : 14; I Cor. 11 : 26; II Cor. 4 : 14; Rom. 1 : 4; 14 : 9), that the title frequently refers to the ascended Lord (and thus has an eschatological meaning), that sometimes the title refers to the pre-existence of Jesus Christ (I Cor. 8 : 6; II Cor. 8 : 9), that the phrase ἐν κυρίῳ refers to the relation between Jesus Christ and the Christian(s). "Thus, it is clear that for Paul κύριος in most instances designates Jesus Christ, the heavenly, ascended Lord, but also the Lord present in the church."²

The "Lord" of whom Paul speaks on the basis of his personal experience is the same "Lord" who is proclaimed in the Church,

¹ Vincent Taylor, *The Names of Jesus* (London: Macmillan, 1953), pp. 44-45. Cf. von Dobschütz, "κύριος Ἰησοῦς," *ZNW*, XXX (1931), 97-123. Robert Morgenthau, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes* (Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958), p. 115, reports that κύριος occurs 275 times in the thirteen Pauline epistles (43 in Rom., 67 in I Cor., 29 in II Cor., 26 in Eph., 24 in I Thess.), the next highest frequency of occurrence being 210 times in Luke-Acts. In Pauline literature Ἰησοῦς occurs 213 times, the highest frequency being 37 times in Romans (p. 107), and Χριστός occurs 379 times, the highest frequency being 65 times in Romans (p. 156).

Moulton and Geden, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897), pp. 569-70, report that Paul uses κύριος alone when quoting from the Old Testament: 7 times in Rom. 14, 1 time in Rom. 15, 5 times in Rom. 16. Otherwise, κύριος occurs usually in the formula ἐν κυρίῳ, according to Moulton and Geden.

Paul's favorite Christological appellation is "Christ Jesus" or "Jesus Christ." Cf. R. P. Martin, *An Early Christian Confession*, pp. 14-16.

² V. H. Neufeld, *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (NTTS, V; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1963), p. 54.

and it is evident that the simplest Pauline formula ("Jesus is Lord") depended on the earliest form of the *ὁμολογία*, namely "Jesus is the Christ."¹ The primitive Church's concept of the risen and exalted Lord was confirmed in Paul's own experience, and the concept of lordship was in the early Church before the LXX title *κύριος* was applied to Jesus.² The description of Jesus as "Messiah" itself implied the ascription to him of cosmic significance, as usage of the title "Messiah" indicated at the time of Jesus.³ Hence, Pauline cosmic Christology is not an aberration in early Christology, but is a development of what was at least latent in earliest understanding of the meaning of Jesus.

Pauline thought did not contain general cosmic or metaphysical speculations. Paul developed no angelology or demonology, nor did he develop detailed exegeses of the work of creation in six days, such as may be found in gnostic and late apocalyptic sources. Paul's view of creation was not gained from a comprehensive survey of this world, but from intensive concentration on the meaning of Christ's lordship.⁴

If Paul's statements about the relation between Jesus as Christ and the cosmic totality stand out as distinct from what other New Testament authors say about Jesus, then, it is not because Paul had no Christological interest nor because his sole concern was to adapt a faith which originated on Palestinian soil and make that faith acceptable on previously foreign soil. Rather, Paul's devotion to the Lord led him to see Jesus' place in the whole creation. Not only his

¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 43, 142.

² Werner Kramer, *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (SBT, 50; London: SCM, 1966), p. 156; Neufeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 58–60.

³ W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*² (London: S.P.C.K., 1955), pp. 39, 41, 173; Neufeld, *op. cit.*, pp. 142–44.

⁴ Nor is the Areopagus Speech an exception to Paul's usual way of thinking, for the theme of the speech, while it speaks of "the God who made the world and everything in it," is its climactic ending that points to "a day" in which the meaning of the world's history is disclosed in "a man" who has been raised from the dead (Acts 17 : 31). The *οὗν* of Acts 17 : 30 and the *καθότι* of 17 : 31 are not logical deductions from the preceding statements, but are founded on Paul's and the early Church's experience of the risen Lord. Bertil Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955), who affirms the Pauline character of this speech (248–52), demonstrates that both this speech and Rom. 1–2 are indebted mostly to "Old Testament-Jewish tradition" rather than to Stoic philosophy (144–69), and denies that the New Testament concept of natural revelation supports any *theologia naturalis* (82).

frequent use of the title κύριος, but also his self-descriptions as "slave" or "apostle" or "ambassador" of Christ imply that Christological interest was his first concern and formed the foundation of his theology. In this way Christology is allowed to speak forth its implications and latent meanings in a way not accomplished before Paul. This is "Christological progress" even if the early Church's basic Christology is not challenged or changed, and even though the wealth of concrete, practical concerns in the Pauline literature may tend to obscure the underlying Christological interest. The particularity of Pauline thought about the relation between creation and redemption is a product of this underlying Christological interest.

B) Pauline Christological progress was not made, however, in isolation from the apostle's life of activity. His devotion to the κύριος was put in the service of the Church, and Paul's insight into Christ's work did serve immediate, tangible needs. In particular, the *cosmic* work of Christ was not removed from the daily concerns of the Church. If Christological statements of pre-Pauline Church tradition were used in Pauline literature as presuppositions, they were so only in the sense that they became the necessary starting points for thought, which latter constantly worked out the implications of those beginning hypotheses.¹ Paul did not receive his Christology ready-made from the Church, but in the midst of his life of devotion and activity, and depending on Church tradition, he worked out for himself and for his congregations the meaning of Christ's lordship.

The fact is that Pauline cosmic Christology exists, as we have it, only in a variety of pragmatic contexts or concrete situations. In order to correct mistaken inferences drawn by the Corinthians from Christian γνῶσις, Paul deals with the proper ethical implications of Christian γνῶσις after having cited approvingly a cardinal article of that γνῶσις, according to which the mediation of Jesus in God the Father's work of creation is asserted (I Cor. 8:6). The analogy between Jesus Christ and Adam (Rom. 5:12ff.) serves the purpose of supporting the assurance that Christ's redemptive work is sufficient for all men (Rom. 5:1-11). Present sufferings are, though extensive, nothing in comparison with "the glory that is to be

¹ Kramer, *op. cit.*, pp. 169-73, 193-94, argues, on the other hand, that Christology is never itself the subject of argument in Paul's thought and that Paul did not develop further the christological propositions in tradition.

revealed to us." The evidence for this assertion is to be found in the eschatological tension of hope which is at work in creation, and which leads to the certainty that the whole creation is impotent to undo the work of God's love for us "in Christ Jesus our Lord" (Rom. 8 : 18-39). The specific need of the Philippians to look after others in unity and service (2 : 4) and thereby to allow God's work in them to enable them to work out their own salvation (2 : 12-13), is a need which brings to mind "the form of a servant" who was also "in the form of God," and who is described in the Christological hymn as one whose humiliation results in exaltation and in cosmic confession of his lordship. Even if it could be proved that Paul did not write this hymn but later quoted it in the Philippian letter, the important point is that this hymn and its cosmic implications are used within its context to meet a tangible ethical need. The Christological hymn of Col. 1 : 15-20 also fits into its context by contributing an indispensable link in the chain of thought from 1 : 3 to 2 : 7, namely by so describing the cosmic work and capacity of Christ as to show that the petitions of the prayer in 1 : 9-14 are not exaggerated. Christ's cosmic lordship occurs as an integral theme in the doxology of Eph. 1 : 3-10, a doxology which announces the theme of the epistle, namely the purpose of God through Christ in his Church.

It was precisely the Christological foundation of his thought, accordingly, which enabled Paul's thought to be relevant to the needs of the Church. Neither the cosmic Christology itself nor Paul's use of it was anthropocentric. The way (*διὰ*) and goal (*εἰς*) of creation and redemption is not man, but Jesus Christ who is Head of the Church and the First-born of all creation. Paul's teaching about creation does not deal "primarily with the meaning of man's history," as B. W. Anderson claims that the biblical doctrine of creation does,¹ but begins with the lordship of the risen Christ, a lordship which includes in its domain far more than man.

The way in which the author of Colossians responded to the counter-movement is notable in this regard, for he did not begin with their human problem as such but, rather, with God's eternal purpose in "the beloved Son." So little was it his concern to battle the counter-movement point for point that scholars are still trying to discover the exact nature and origin of the Colossian error.

¹ B. W. Anderson, "The Earth Is the Lord's," *Interp.*, IX (1955), 9.

This pastoral procedure was not problem-centered, for his view of redemption was not anthropocentric, but an implicate of Christ's lordship. Having begun with God's eternal purpose, the author moved on to the meaning of the new life founded on Christ's lordship, thereby showing the relevance of Christ's lordship to man and the world. The same procedure is evident in Romans 8, according to which Paul begins with the gospel indicative (8 : 1-11), on the basis of which he outlines an imperative (8 : 12-17), the motivation for which is provided by extending the perspective of the Romans beyond themselves to creation (8 : 19-25), the Spirit (8 : 26-27), and God's purpose (8 : 28-30), all of which motivations to follow the imperative are summed up in the fact that "God is for us" through his love "in Christ Jesus our Lord" (8 : 31-39).

V. THE RELEVANCE OF THIS MOTIF FOR MODERN MAN

What Paul meant has been delineated as far as this writer's present circumstances and abilities permit. What follows is a consequence of the preceding study, for it is desirable to conclude with some explicit statement, albeit painfully brief, of the meaning for us today of Christ's lordship over creation and redemption.

The subject of this study is of central importance to our situation. Decidedly the question is not for us, any more than it was for Paul: "Is it possible to accept the modern account of the human situation and remain intelligently and with integrity a Christian?"¹ *Prima facie* evidence that allows us to take for granted the intelligence and integrity of "the modern account" (once that is found) is lacking, and one is hard put to find any tactical apologetic advantage in assuming a merely defensive position as Christians. Nor can the effort to "base self-identity on freedom from cosmic purpose" receive assistance from Pauline theology.² Such efforts and questions,

¹ Stanley Brice Frost, *Standing and Understanding : A Re-appraisal of the Christian Faith* (Montreal: McGill University Press, 1969), p. 10. Frost's insistence on beginning with "the accepted, unchallengeable premise of all our thinking," namely "the idea of a universe of natural order" (182), does not go hand in hand with equal insistence on any theological premise. More effective methodology for interdisciplinary study is the true dialogue propounded by Charles A. M. Hall, *The Common Quest* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965).

² Daniel Callahan, "Cosmic Purpose and Self-Identity," *TTod*, XXV (1968), 184 suggests that self-identity has traditionally been accomplished

self-centered as they are in essence, will do justice neither to the full scope of Pauline theology nor to the service which is required of the Church in this time. They are inadequate both theologically and pragmatically.

What is needed, rather, as sociologist Peter Berger says, is the capacity "to be in a cognitive minority and to accept the social consequences of this position," or the courage "to deviate from the taken-for-granted reality-assumptions of secularized culture..."¹ There is such a thing as irrelevant relevance, which some theological trends seem to have avoided less than has Berger, who would "immerse the student in the most exacting theological scholarship that can be devised," emphatically including both biblical languages.² The most "relevant" approach may have to be the most "radical," if it is to have any identity of its own to contribute. It is the contention of these final pages that precisely cosmic Christology is radically relevant to the contemporary world.

There is reason to hope that the concept of the relation between creation and redemption under Christ's lordship will come into its own in the remaining decades of the twentieth century.³ What theme in Pauline theology is more relevant to the ecological crisis, the hardened secularism, or the "counter-cultures" and dismay that react against the violence of the *status quo*?

The charge that there is a "theological vacuum" at the point of the relation between man and the creation rings false in light of the evidence we have seen, including: the unity between man and the creation about which Paul wrote to the Romans, the capacity of the *pleroma* to bring each creature to its goal in God's purpose (Col. 1:19), the work of Christ in sustaining the relation between

either on the basis of cosmic purpose or by way of freedom from cosmic purpose.

¹ Peter Berger, "Some Sociological Comments on Theological Education," *Perspective: A Journal of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary*, 2 (1968), 134.

² *Ibid.*, p. 137.

³ Cf., *inter alia*: H. Paul Santmire, "The Struggle for an Ecological Theology: A Case in Point," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVII (1970), 275-77; *supra*, Chapter I, n. 1. James M. Robinson, "World in Modern Theology and in New Testament Theology," in J. M. Richards (ed.), *Soli Deo Gloria* (Richmond: John Knox, 1968), pp. 89, 110, thinks that "the new theology may well be cast primarily in terms of world," but he thoroughly misunderstands Paul in this regard and gives an unclear picture of what the creation is—perhaps in great part because in this essay he describes New Testament theology only in light of his discussion of modern theology.

Creator and creature (Col. 1 : 17), the plan for the fulness of time (Eph. 1 : 10).¹ Man's ethical responsibility for the world, a theme emphasized from the Jahwist (Gen. 2 : 15, "to till it and to keep it") through such prophets as II Isaiah and through apocalyptic literature to Paul (Rom. 8 : 19ff.; 14 : 14; etc.), has been part of "traditional" theology from the beginning.

While contending that America must "outgrow its Growth Myth," according to which resources are plundered without regard to nature and posterity, biologist-ecologist René Dubos maintains that the intellectual and practical limitations of scientific rationalism have become increasingly evident, for scientism cannot provide what man needs, namely the awareness "that his whole being is related to the cosmos."² In a time when no single system of thought, no one *Weltanschauung*, is valid to provide us with a sense of significance and of universal relatedness, there is need for just the emphasis of Paul on the lordship of Christ in creation and redemption. As the Church confronts man's ecological crisis, it is to be expected that the validity and meaning of Paul's emphasis on cosmic Christology will be rediscovered.

The way in which Paul relates creation and redemption may help us, in the second place, to maintain a dimension of transcendence in the midst of the hard secularism of modern man's self-understanding. This secular mood and its antiteleological interpretation of nature and history has replaced, as Langdon Gilkey observes, "any view of God at all, be it metaphysical or Biblical, immanent or transcendent."³ Relativity has been absolutized by "raw" secularity, so that it is not only a madman who cries out, "Who gave us

¹ Richard L. Means, "Man and Nature: The Theological Vacuum," *The Christian Century*, LXXXV (1968), 579-81; Means, "Ecology and the Contemporary Religious Conscience," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI (1969), 1546-49.

² René Dubos, *So Human an Animal* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons Lyceum Edition, 1968), p. 183; cf. pp. 209, 215-16. Concerning the ecological crisis, cf. writings of Rachel Carson, Barry Commoner, Paul Ehrlich and the report of the International Symposium on Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth, sponsored by the Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, edited by William L. Thomas, Jr., *et al.*, *Man's Role in Changing the Face of the Earth* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956).

³ Langdon Gilkey, *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 29.

the sponge to wipe away the whole horizon?"¹ Rabbi Richard Rubenstein's probing question speaks for any man who really knows that he lives in the same world as Auschwitz, Dresden, Hiroshima, My Lai: "When I say we live in the time of the death of God, I mean that the thread uniting God and man, heaven and earth, has been broken. We stand in a cold, silent, unfeeling cosmos, unaided by any purposeful power beyond our own resources. After Auschwitz, what else can a Jew say about God?"²

The possibility of despairing that the last word about man's life is that of the speechless, cold and ruthless cosmic powers, an interpretation of life no less pervasive and dehumanizing than the "vacuum of belief" in secularism's "metaphysical void," was known to Paul's contemporaries.³ If Paul and the early Church refused to allow those powers to have the last word, we can insist, with Gilkey, on the difference between secular self-understanding and the realities of secular existence, for our secular life, in its contingency and its search for meaning, remains open both to an ultimate dimension and to a mythic consciousness of it.⁴ We can refuse to be ruled by the hardened secular spirit of our times and look behind that to the secular man, for whom religious proclamation is no more improbable of being heard and no more inherently meaningless than to any previous man, and for whom the lordship of Christ in creation is the only adequate context within which to live out the meaning of his lordship in redemption.

Contrary to the expectations of many, however, the challenge to secularism which Pauline theology facilitates is not a *theologia naturalis*, not merely continuity from secular questions to sacred

¹ Friedrich Nietzsche, "The Madman," *Gay Science*, No. 125.

² Richard L. Rubenstein, *After Auschwitz: Radical Theology and Contemporary Judaism* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1966), p. 152.

³ The quoted phrases are those of Nathan A. Scott, Jr., *The Broken Center; Studies in the Theological Horizon of Modern Literature* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966).

⁴ Gilkey, *op. cit.*, has described more convincingly than any other scholar known to me the depth of the problem for religious thought that is in secularism. His book is only a "prolegomenon" to theology, and it remains to be seen whether that theology will be both secular and Christian. Difficulties in Gilkey's approach have been mentioned in my review of this book in *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, XXXIX (1971).

Thomas D. Parker, "How Can We Think of God?—Another Look at Transcendence," *McCormick Quarterly*, XX (1967), 79–96, observes that transcendence and immanence are correlative concepts, and that "human autonomy and secular relativism are incompatible" (94).

answers (Tillich), not the tortuous effort to eschew all nonsecular assumptions before one speaks the first syllable of religious language (Gilkey). In spite of the apparent naiveté and "irrelevance" of its procedure, theological thinking that is adequate to challenge hard secularism will move from God, the source and goal of creation, and from Jesus Christ the Lord, through whom God's works of creation and redemption are accomplished, toward both creation and redemption. The primary object of Christian thought, according to Pauline theology, is neither the creation alone nor the realm of redemption alone, but the Lord in whom the relation between creation and redemption is clarified. This order of priorities, if rigorously applied in the contemporary situation, will disclose, more tellingly than the popular "dialogue disciplines" of American theological education, the sterility of a theology that is based on "talk about talk" (as much of contemporary philosophy has been labeled) in contrast to the vigor and effectiveness of a theology which explicates Christ's lordship not from but *to* nature and *to* us within the creation.

Third, the violence of "an established disorder" has provoked dismay, disgust, rebellion, and a host of "countercultures" among multitudes of *de facto* disenfranchised minorities.¹ One need not look far at any given time to see the realities of evil which have produced these reactions. At the time of this writing, for instance, evidence increases that democratic institutions in the United States are much less democratic than has been generally assumed.² The Chicago Democratic Convention of 1968, perhaps more within the halls than on the streets, was only one symptom that indicated, while all the world was watching, the depth of the problem. Two years after Nobel Peace Prize recipient Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. was shot, as he brought his noble non-violent movement to the aid of garbage

¹ The quoted phrase is from William Sloane Coffin, Jr., participant in "A Center Report: When Liberty and Authority Conflict," *The Center Magazine*, III (1970), 73.

² Cf. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders* (New York: E. P. Dutton Bantam Books, 1968); "Protest in the Sixties," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 382 (March, 1969); "The Conscience of the City," *Daedalus*, 97 (1968); "Students and Politics," *Daedalus*, 97 (1968); John R. Fry, *Fire and Blackstone* (New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1969); Eugene J. McCarthy, *The Year of the People* (New York: Doubleday, 1969).

collectors, one-third of American churchmen responded that "he brought it on himself."¹

Turning beyond provocations to counter-cultures within the United States, one sees the new "third world" as a reaction against both East and West, and the tragedy of Vietnam, which wants to be free from both China and the United States, is one instance of this. In Vietnam every humanitarian impulse has been repeatedly denied as each side attempted to escalate on an elevator of human carnage to a position above that of the other side.² The question is whether the most powerful of these contenders does not bear the greatest moral guilt for the disorder that it attempts to establish there. To choose an example of repression within an otherwise emergent portion of the third world, the military regime in Brazil invents a new reign of terror by picking up people at random, putting them through unspeakable torture, and releasing them, rather than having them disappear, for in this way the whole populace can be subdued by fear of torture.³

What is our response? The question seems worth entertaining whether any morally responsible person or anyone who is sensitive to other people can be bereft of a driving tension within himself under the circumstances of this phase of history. One may have hope for the long run of history, but this hope will be unrealistic if it is unaware of the persecutions, crucifixions, genocides, and hundred-years wars which are also part of history. Whatever may be the direction of history as a whole, ours is a time less of expansion than of restriction of even humane pursuits, less of health and

¹ Milton Rokeach, "Faith, Hope and Bigotry," *Psychology Today*, 3 (1970), 36. (This article based on research reported in *Review of Religious Research*, XI 1, not available at this writing.)

² Cf. Robert McAfee Brown *et al.*, *Vietnam: Crisis of Conscience* (New York: Association Press, 1967); Marvin E. Gettleman, *Vietnam: History, Documents, and Opinions on a Major World Crisis* (New York: Fawcett Crest Book, 1965); Thich Nhat Hanh, *Vietnam, Lotus in a Sea of Fire* (New York: Hill & Wang, 1967); George McTurnan Kahin and John W. Lewis, *The United States in Vietnam* (New York: Dial Press Delta Book, 1967); Jean Lacouture, *Vietnam: Between Two Truces* (New York: Random House Vintage Book, 1966); Robert Scheer, *How the United States Got Involved in Vietnam* (Santa Barbara, California: Fund for the Republic, 1965); Franz Schurmann *et al.*, *The Politics of Escalation in Vietnam* (Greenwich, Conn.: Fawcett Premier Book, 1966).

³ Robert H. Bolton, "Brazilian Torture: Specifically New, Specifically Terrible," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVII (1970), 387-88.

education and human welfare than of a military-industrial monster that devours resources in both the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. which ought to minister to elemental needs of our neighbors, less a time of good neighbor policies than of containment policies, less a time of singing "we shall overcome" than of wondering when they will ever learn. If one happens to live in such a time of descent and contraction, does he serve that time well by not saying so? We have to work our way through the here and now of any depression of the human spirit, while holding fast to our ultimate hopes—especially when it appears doubtful that we can get there from here.

Let it be submitted that without the lordship of Christ in the creation as well as in the confines of the pietistic soul, there will be nothing to prevent us from becoming as violent, hopeless, and un-human as the *status quo* against which we certainly must contend, and nothing to enable our most energetic challenge to be anything more than a minor "counter-culture" of some kind that is inevitably formed too much in the image of that against which it reacts.

Let it be submitted that when we live on the basis of the cosmic scope of redemption, and think within the context of Christ's complete work, our responses may become something better than mere blind reaction, and our necessary and healthy maladjustments to a sick society may be redemptive in their effect. For some of us such a life and thought will be the way of forceful engagement in overt challenge or even revolution, for others the way both of withdrawal from activism and of radical refusal "to compromise with the forms and forces of our society," but for all of us it will be the way of seed being sowed in the ground even though we cannot now know whether we will be followed by fresh grain that took root in our sacrifice.¹ It is an extraordinary "self-understanding" which does that, namely one that is rooted in the maturing understanding of One whose name, because of his resurrection, is above every name, and whose work it is to bring together the cosmic totality and God's redemptive purpose.

¹ The quoted phrase is from Jacques Ellul, "Mirror of These Ten Years," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVII (1970), 200-04.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. EXEGETICAL, GRAMMATICAL, AND LINGUISTIC STUDIES

A. Books

- Abbott, T. K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians* (*The International Critical Commentary*), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Allo, E.-B., *Saint Paul, Première épître aux Corinthiens*, Paris: Libraire Lecoffre, 1935.
- Althaus, Paul, *Der Brief an die Römer* (*Das Neue Testament Deutsch*, Vol. VI), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949.
- Bandstra, Andrew John, *The Law and the Elements of the World* (*An Exegetical Study in Aspects of Paul's Teaching*), Kampen: H. Kok, 1964.
- Barnikol, Ernst, *Philipp 2; der marcionitische Ursprung des Mythosatzes Phil., ii. 6-7*, Kiel: W. G. Muhlau, 1932.
- Barrett, C. K., *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, HNTC, New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- , *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Beare, Francis W., "The Epistle to the Colossians: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. George Buttrick, Vol. XI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, pp. 131-241.
- , "The Epistle to the Ephesians," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. George Buttrick, Vol. X, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 595-749.
- , *The Epistle to the Philippians* (HNTC, ed. Henry Chadwick), New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Beckwith, I. T., *The Apocalypse of John*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1919.
- Bengel, J. A., *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*, editio tertia, London: David Nutt, 1855.
- Bonnard, Pierre, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Philippiens* (CNT, Vol. X), Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950.
- Brandenburger, Egon, *Adam und Christus, Exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Röm. 5: 12-21 (1: Kor. 15)*, Neukirchen Kreis Moers: Neukirchener Verlag, 1962.
- Burton, Ernest DeWitt, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (*International Critical Commentary*), Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1921.
- Cambier, J., *L'Évangile de Dieu selon l'Épître aux Romains: Exégèse et Théologie biblique*, Tome I (*L'Évangile de la Justice et de la Grâce*), (*Studia Neotestamentica*, 3), Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1967.
- Conzelmann, Hans, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (K-EKNT¹¹, V), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969.
- Craig, Clarence Tucker, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. George Buttrick, Vol. X, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1953, pp. 1-262.
- Deissmann, Adolf, *Die neutestamentliche Formel "In Christo Jesu"*, Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1892.

- Dibelius, Martin, *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon* (HNT, ed. H. Lietzmann, Band XII), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.
- Dodd, Charles Harold, *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans* (MNTC), London: Collins Fontana Books, 1959.
- , *The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953.
- Eadie, John, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Ephesians*, second edition, New York: Robert Carter and Brothers, 1861.
- Findlay, G. G., "The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll, Vol. II, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1917, pp. 729-953.
- Foerster, Werner and Quell, Gottfried, *Lord* (Bible Key Words from Gerhard Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. VIII), London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- Godet, F. L., *Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, Vol. I, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.
- , *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1956.
- Goodspeed, E. J., *The Meaning of Ephesians*, Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, 1933.
- Goudge, Henry Leighton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Westminster Commentaries), London: Methuen, 1903.
- Hugedé, N., *Commentaire de l'Épître aux Colossiens*, Geneva: Labor & Fides, 1968.
- Hunter, A. M., *Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians* (The Layman's Bible Commentary, ed. B. H. Kelly, Vol. XXII), Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Jervell, J., *Imago Dei*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Kennedy, H. A. A., "The Epistle to the Philippians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll, Vol. III, London: Hodder and Stoughton, n. d., pp. 397-473.
- Kepler, T. S., *The Book of Revelation*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Leahy, D. J., "The Epistle to the Ephesians," *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, eds. Dom Bernard Orchard et al., London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1953, pp. 1119-1126.
- Leenhardt, Franz-J., *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Romains* (CNT, Vol. VI), Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1957.
- Lietzmann, Hans, *An die Korinther I-II*, zweite Auflage (HNT, ed. H. Lietzmann, Band IX), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1923.
- Lightfoot, J. B., *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan Publishing House, 1957.
- , *Saint Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, eighth edition, London: Macmillan and Co., 1886.
- , *Saint Paul's Epistle to the Philippians*, tenth edition, London: Macmillan and Co., 1890.
- Lipsius, R. A., "Die Briefe an die Galater, Römer, Philipper," *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, eds. H. J. Holtzmann et al., Vol. II, zweite Auflage, Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1893.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, *Die Briefe an die Philipper, an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, achte Auflage (K-EKNT, beg. von H. A. W. Meyer, Band IX), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1930.

- Lohse, Eduard, *Die Briefe an die Kolosser und an Philemon* (K-EKNT, IX: 2), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968.
- Lund, N. W., *Chiasmus in the New Testament*, Chapel Hill, N. C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1942.
- Manson, T. W., *The Teaching of Jesus*, second edition, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1939.
- Martin, R. P., *An Early Christian Confession: Philippians II. 5-11 in Recent Interpretation*, London: Tyndale Press, 1960.
- Masson, Charles, *L'Épître de Saint Paul aux Colossiens* (CNT, Vol. X), Neuchâtel and Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1950.
- Medebielle, R. P., "Épîtres de la Captivité," *La Sainte Bible*, ed. Louis Pirot, Vol. XII, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951, pp. 7-126.
- Meyer, H. A. W., *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistles to the Corinthians*, New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1884.
- , *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Romans*, Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1876.
- , *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Kolosser und an Philemon*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1848.
- Michel, Otto, *Der Brief an die Römer*, elfte Auflage (K-EKNT, beg. von H. A. W. Meyer, vierte Abteilung), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1957.
- Moule, C. F. D., *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Colossians and to Philemon* (CGTC, ed. C. F. D. Moule), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
- Peake, A. S., "The Epistle to the Colossians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll, Vol. III, London: Hodder and Stoughton, n. d., pp. 475-547.
- Percy, Ernst, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und Epheserbriefe* (Skrifter Utgivna Av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, Vol. XXXIX), Lund: Gleerup, 1946.
- Radford, Lewis B., *The Epistle to the Colossians and the Epistle to Philemon*, London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1931.
- Rees, W., "1 and 2 Corinthians," *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, eds. Bernard Orchard et al., London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1952, pp. 1081-1111.
- Richardson, Donald W., *The Revelation of Jesus Christ*, Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1939.
- Robertson, Archibald and Plummer, Alfred, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, second edition (*The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs), Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1914.
- Robinson, J. Armitage, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1903.
- Salmond, S. D. F., "The Epistle to the Ephesians," *The Expositor's Greek Testament*, ed. W. R. Nicoll, Vol. III, London: Hodder and Stoughton, n. d., pp. 201-395.
- Sanday, William and Headlam, Arthur C., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans* (ICC), New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896.
- Schlier, Heinrich, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1957.
- Schmauch, Werner, *Beiheft to Lohmeyer, Ernst, Die Briefe an die Philipper*,

- Kolosser und an Philemon* (K-EKNT, beg. von H. A. W. Meyer, Band IX), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1964.
- Schmiedel, P. W., *Die Briefe an die Thessalonicher und an die Korinther*, zweite Auflage (*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. II), Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1892.
- Schweizer, Eduard, *Spirit of God* (*Bible Key Words from Kittel's Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. IX), London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Scott, E. F., *The Epistles of Paul to the Colossians, to Philemon and to the Ephesians* (MNTC, ed. James Moffatt), ninth impression of 1930 ed., London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1958.
- , "The Epistle to the Philippians: Introduction and Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible*, ed. George Buttrick, Vol. XI, Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1955, pp. 1-129.
- Scroggs, Robin, *The Last Adam*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1966.
- Selwyn, E. G., *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, second edition, London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1955.
- Soden, Hans von, *Der Brief an die Epheser* (*Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. III), Freiburg: J. C. B. Mohr, 1891.
- Spicq, R. P. C., "Épîtres aux Corinthiens," *La Sainte Bible*, ed. Louis Pirot, Vol. XI, 2^e Partie, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951, pp. 161-297.
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Epistle to the Romans*, London: Epworth Press, 1955.
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Names of Jesus*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1953.
- , *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London: Macmillan, 1952.
- Theissen, A., "Romans," *A Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture*, Orchard et al., editors, London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1953, pp. 1045-80.
- Tödt, Heinz Eduard, *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition* (*The New Testament Library*), Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.
- Viard, R. P. A., "Épître aux Romains traduite et commentée," *La Sainte Bible*, ed. Louis Pirot, Vol. XI, 2^e Partie, Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1951, pp. 1-159.
- Vincent, Marvin, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and to Philemon* (*The International Critical Commentary*, eds. S. R. Driver, A. Plummer, and C. A. Briggs), fifth impression of 1897 edition, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1955.
- Weiss, Bernhard, *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief des Paulus an die Römer*, siebente Auflage, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1886.
- Weiss, Johannes, *Beiträge zur Paulinischen Rhetorik*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1897.
- , *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1910.
- Wette, W. M. L. de, *Kurze Erklärung des Briefes an die Römer*, dritte Ausgabe, Leipzig: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1841.

B. Articles

- Allmen, D. von, "Reconciliation du monde et christologie cosmique, de II Cor. 5 : 14-21 à Col. 1 : 15-23," *RHPR*, 48 (1968), 32-45.
- Barth, Markus, Review of N. Kehl, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief*, in *CBQ*, 30 (1968), 106-10.
- Bauernfeind, "μάταιος," *TWNT*, IV, 525-30.
- Behm, Johannes, "καίνεζ," *TWNT*, III (1938), 405-52.
- Bornkamm, Günther, "μυστήριον," *TWNT*, IV (1943), 809-31.
- Brockington, L. H., "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament

- Use of $\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha$," *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham, Oxford: B. Blackwell, 1955, pp. 1ff.
- Burney, C. F., "Christ as the APXH of Creation (Prov. viii 22, Col. i 15-18, Rev. iii 14)," *JTS*, XXVII (1926), 160-77.
- Cambier, J., "Péchés des Hommes et Pêché d'Adam en Rom. V. 12," *NTSt*, 11 (1964), 217-55.
- Carrez, Maurice, "La signification actuelle pour l'histoire du salut du visible et de l'invisible dans la pensée paulinienne," *Oikonomia: Heilsgeschichte als Thema der Theologie (Oscar Cullmann zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet)*, Hsg. Felix Christ, Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich Evang. Verlag GmbH, 1967.
- Cerfaux, Lucien, " 'Kyrios' dans les citations paulinienne de l'Ancien Testament," *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis*, XX (1953), 4-17.
- , "Le Titre 'Kyrios' et la dignité royale de Jésus," *RSPT*, XII (1923), 125-53.
- Cranfield, C. E. B., "On Some of the Problems in the Interpretation of Romans 5 : 12," *SJT*, 22 (1969), 324-41.
- , "Romans 8 : 28," *SJT*, 19 (1966), 204-15.
- Danker, F. W., "Romans V. 12. Sin Under Law," *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 424-39.
- Delling, Gerhard, "ἀρχή," *TWNT*, I (1933), 477-83.
- Dobschütz, E. von, "κύριος Ἰησοῦς," *ZNW*, XXX (1931), 97-123.
- Foerster, Werner, "δαίμων," *TWNT*, II (1935), pp. 1-21.
- , "κτίζω," *TWNT*, III (1938), 1027-1034.
- Gerritzen, Dom François, "Le sens et l'origine de l'EN ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ paulinien," *Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, volumen secundum (Studiorum Paulinorum Congressus Internationalis Catholicus, 1961; Rome, 1963), pp. 323-31.
- Griffith, G. O., "The Apocalyptic Note in Romans," *ET*, LVI (1945), 153-55.
- Güemes, H., "La *eleutheria* en las Epístolas paulinas. Examen de textos. II. Epístola a los Romanos," *Estudios Bíblicos*, XX (1963), 219-42.
- Harrisville, Roy A., "The Concept of Newness in the New Testament," *JBL*, LXXIV (1955), 69-79.
- Jeremias, Joachim, "Ἀδάμ," *TWNT*, I (1933), 141-43.
- , "Zu Phil ii 7: EAYTON EKENOSEN," *XAPIS KAI SOΦIA, Festschrift Karl Heinrich Rengstorf*, Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964, pp. 182-88; also in *NT*, VI, (1963), 182-88.
- Kittel, Gerhard, "Der übertragene Gebrauch von 'Bild' im NT," *TWNT*, II (1935), 393-96.
- Kleinknecht, Hermann, "Der griechische Sprachgebrauch von εἰκόν," *TWNT*, II (1935), 386-87.
- Langkammer, H., "Die Einwohnung der 'absoluten Seinsfülle' in Christus. Bemerkungen zu Kol 1, 19," *Biblische Zeitschrift*, 12 (1968), 258-63.
- Lattey, Cuthbert, "The Codex Ephraemi Rescriptus on Romans 9 : 5," *ET*, XXXV (1923-24), 42-43.
- , "The Codex Vaticanus on Romans 9 : 5," *ET*, XXXIV (1922-23), 331.
- Martin, R. P., "Μορφή in Philippins ii. 6," *ET*, LXX (1959), 183-84.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm, "πρωτότοκος," *TWNT*, VI (1959), 872-82.
- Michel, Otto, "οἰκονομία," *TWNT*, V (1954), 154-55.
- Münderlein, G., "Die Erwählung durch das Pleroma," *NTSt*, 8 (1962), 264-76.
- Neugebauer, F., "Das Paulinische 'In Christo,'" *NTSt*, 4 (1957), 124-38.
- Oepke, Albrecht, "δαί," *TWNT*, II (1935), 64-69.
- O'Neill, J. C., "The Use of KYRIOS in the Book of Acts," *SJT*, VIII (1955), 155-74.

- Pope, R. M., "Studies in Pauline Vocabulary: Of the Heavenly Places," *ET*, XXIII (1912), 365-68.
- Reicke, Bo, "παῖς," *TWNT*(E), V, 886-96.
- Robinson, D. W. B., "ἀρπαγμός: The Deliverance Jesus Refused?," *ET*, LXXX (1969), 253-54.
- Sagnard, F. M. M., "A propos de I Cor., VIII, 6," *Ephemerides Theologiae Lovaniensis*, XXVI (1950), 54-58.
- Sasse, Hermann, "κοσμέω, κόσμος, κόσμιος, κοσμικός," *TWNT*, III (1938), 867-98.
- Schlier, Heinrich, "κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιόομαι," *TWNT*, III (1938), 672-81.
- Schulz, Siegfried, "Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus," *ZNW*, LIII (1962), 125-44.
- Torrey, C. C., "Apocalypse," *Jewish Encyclopedia*, Vol. I, 669-75.
- Trudinger, Paul, "ἀρπαγμός and the Christological Significance of the Ascension," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 279.
- Viard, A., "Expectatio creaturae (Rom. VIII, 19-22)," *RB*, LIX (1952), 337-54.
- Wallace, D. H., "A Note on Morphé," *TZ*, 22 (1966), 19-25.

II. HISTORICAL AND LITERARY STUDIES

A. Books

- Albright, William F., *From The Stone Age to Christianity, Monotheism and the Historical Process*, Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946.
- Angus, S., *The Mystery-Religions and Christianity*, New York: Scribner's, 1925.
- Barrett, C. K., editor, *The New Testament Background: Selected Documents*, London: S.P.C.K., 1958.
- Black, Matthew, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Christian Doctrine*, London: Athlone Press, 1966.
- Borsch, Frederick Houk, *The Son of Man in Myth and History*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967.
- Bousset, Wilhelm, *Jesus der Herr (FRLANT, Neue Folge, 8. Heft)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1916.
- , *Kyrios Christos, Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*, zweite Auflage (*FRLANT, Neue Folge, 4. Heft*), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.
- Braun, Herbert, *Qumran und das Neue Testament*, II, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1966.
- Bright, John, *A History of Israel*, London: SCM, 1960.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, third edition, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1957.
- , *Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting*, New York: Meridian Books, 1956.
- , *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (FRLANT, XIII)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Burkitt, F. C., *Church and Gnosis: A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century*, Cambridge: University Press, 1932.
- Charles, R. H., *Religious Development Between the Old and New Testaments*, London: Oxford University Press, 1914.
- Clarke, W. K. Lowther, *New Testament Problems*, London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1929.

- Clemen, Carl, *Primitive Christianity and its Non-Jewish Sources*, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1912.
- Colpe, Carsten, *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961.
- Cullmann, Oscar, *The Earliest Christian Confessions*, London: Lutterworth, 1949.
- , *The Early Church: Historical and Theological Studies*, London: SCM, 1956.
- Dalman, G., *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1909.
- Davies, W. D., *Christian Origins and Judaism*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- , *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism*, London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Deichgräber, Reinhard, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit: Untersuchungen zu Form, Sprache und Stil der frühchristlichen Hymnus (SUNT, V)*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Deissmann, Adolf, *Light From the Ancient East*, New York: George H. Doran, 1927.
- , *Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History*, New York: Harper and Brothers Torchbooks, 1957.
- Dibelius, Martin, *A Fresh Approach to the New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, Hertford, England: Ivor Nicholson and Watson, 1936.
- , *An die Kolosser, Epheser, an Philemon (HNT, ed. Hans Lietzmann, Vol. XII)*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1927.
- Dodd, Charles Harold, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- , *New Testament Studies*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1953.
- , *The Parables of the Kingdom*, rev. ed., New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936.
- Dupont, Dom Jacques, O.S.B., *Gnosis, la Connaissance religieuse dans les Épîtres de Saint Paul*, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1949.
- Filson, Floyd V., *A New Testament History*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- , *The New Testament Against Its Environment (SBT, III)*, London: SCM Press, 1950.
- Foerster, Werner, *Herr Ist Jesus (Neutestamentliche Forschungen, zweite Reihe: Untersuchungen zum Kirchenproblem des Urchristentums, erste Heft)*, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1924.
- Fuller, Reginald H., *The New Testament in Current Study*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1962.
- Gärtner, Bertil, *The Theology of the Gospel according to Thomas*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.
- Grant, F. C., editor, *Form Criticism: A New Method of New Testament Research*, Chicago: Willett, Clark & Co., 1934.
- , *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*, New York: Abingdon Press, 1950.
- Grant, Robert M., *Gnosticism, An Anthology*, London: Collins, 1961.
- , *A Historical Introduction to the New Testament*, New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Grant, Robert M. and Freedman, David Noel, *The Secret Sayings of Jesus*, London: Collins Fontana Book, 1960.

- Grobel, *The Gospel of Truth*, New York: Abingdon, 1960.
- Gunkel, Hermann, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit, eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung über Gen. 1 und Apoc. Joh. 12*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
- Hahn, Ferdinand, *Christologische Hoheitstitel, ihre Geschichte im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT, LXXXIII), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1963. (Eng. tr. by Knight and Ogg; London: Lutterworth, 1969).
- Hegermann, Harald, *Die Vorstellung vom Schöpfungsmittler im Hellenistischen Judentum und Urchristentum* (TU, 82), Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1961.
- Hennecke, Edgar (ed.), *Gospels and Related Writings*, ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and English translation ed. R. McL. Wilson, *New Testament Apocrypha*, Vol. I, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Hoskyns, Edwyn and Davey, Noel, *The Riddle of the New Testament*, third edition, London: Faber and Faber Limited, 1947.
- Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr., *The Origin of I Corinthians*, London: S.P.C.K., 1965.
- Jeremias, Joachim, *The Parables of Jesus*, London: SCM, 1954.
- Jonas, Hans, *The Gnostic Religion, The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity*, second edition, Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.
- Kirby, J. C., *Ephesians: Baptism and Pentecost (An Inquiry into the Structure and Purpose of the Epistle to the Ephesians)*, London: S.P.C.K., 1968.
- Knox, Wilfred L., *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1939.
- , *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1925.
- Kümmel, Werner G. (reviser), and Feine, Paul and Behm, Johannes, *Einführung in das Neue Testament*¹⁴, Heidelberg: Quelle und Meyer, 1965. (English tr. by A. J. Mattill, Jr.; New York: Abingdon, 1966).
- Kümmel, W. G., *Das Neue Testament, Geschichte der Erforschung seiner Probleme*, Freiburg: Karl Alber, 1958.
- Lohmeyer, Ernst, *Christuskult und Kaiserkult, (Sammlung Gemeinverständlicher Vorträge und Schriften aus dem Gebiet der Theologie und Religionsgeschichte, Vol. XC)*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1919.
- , *Kyrios Jesus: eine Untersuchung zu Phil. 2: 5–11*, (Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1927–28), zweite Auflage, Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961.
- Loofs, F., *Das altkirchliche Zeugnis gegen die herrschende Auffassung der Kenosisstelle*, (Theologische Studien und Kritiken, C, 1927–38), 1–102.
- Martin, Ralph P., *Carmen Christi: Philippians ii. 5–11 in Recent Interpretation and in the Setting of Early Christian Worship* (SNTSMS, 4), Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Montefiore, C. J. G., *Judaism and St. Paul*, London: Max Goschen, 1914.
- Neufeld, V. H., *The Earliest Christian Confessions* (NTTS, V), Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1963.
- Nock, A. D., *Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background*, New York: Harper and Row, 1964.
- Norden, Eduard, *Agnostos Theos, Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*, Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Reitzenstein, Richard, *Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen nach ihren Grundgedanken und Wirkungen*, dritte Auflage, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.
- , *Poimandres*, Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1904.
- Schmithals, Walter, *Die Gnosis in Korinth, eine Untersuchung zu den Korin-*

- therbriefen*² (FRLANT, neue folge, XLVIII), Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1965.
- Smith, David, *The Life and Letters of St. Paul*, New York: Harper and Brothers, n. d.
- Stendahl, Krister (ed.), *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.
- Unnik, W. C. van, *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings* (SBT, XXX), London: SCM, 1960.
- , *Tarsus or Jerusalem, The City of Paul's Youth*, London: Epworth Press, 1962.
- Weiss, Johannes, *Earliest Christianity, A History of the Period A. D. 30-150*, 2 vols., New York: Harper and Brothers Torchbooks, 1959.
- Wilson, R. McL., *The Gnostic Problem*, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1958.
- , *The Gospel of Philip*, New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- , *Studies in the Gospel of Thomas*, London: A. R. Mowbray, 1960.

B. Articles

- Arai, Sasague, "Zur Christologie des Apocryphons des Johannes," *NTSt*, 15 (1969), 302-18.
- Argyle, A. W., "The Evidence for the Belief that our Lord Claimed To Be Divine," *ET*, LXI (1949-50), 228-32.
- Bammel, Ernst, "Versuch zu Col 1:15-20," *ZNW*, LII (1961), 88-95.
- Barrett, C. K., "Things Sacrificed to Idols," *NTSt*, XI (1965), 138-153.
- Black, Matthew, "The Interpretation of Romans VIII 28," *Neotestamentica et Patristica*, ed. W. C. van Unnik, et al., Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962, pp. 166-72.
- , "The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate," *BJRL*, XLV (1963), 305-18.
- , "Unsolved New Testament Problems—The 'Son of Man' in the Teaching of Jesus," *ET*, LX (1948-49), 32-36.
- Bornkamm, G., "Zum Verständnis des Christus-Hymnus Phil ii 6-11," *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum, Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Vol. II, zweite Auflage, (*Beiträge zur Evangelischen Theologie*, Vol. XXVIII), München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1963.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, "Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis," *ZNW*, XIX (1919-20), 165-74.
- Case, Shirley Jackson, "The Alleged Messianic Consciousness of Jesus," *JBL*, XLVI (1927), 1-19.
- Charles, R. H., "Apocalyptic Literature," *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, Vol. I, 109-110.
- , "Eschatology," *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. II, cols. 1335-91.
- Coppens, Joseph, "'Mystery' in the theology of Saint Paul and its parallels at Qumran," *Paul and Qumran*, ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1968.
- Coutts, J., "The Relationship of Ephesians and Colossians," *NTSt*, 4 (1958), 201-07.
- Craddock, Fred B., "'All Things in Him': A Critical Note on Col. I.15-20," *NTSt*, 12 (1965), 78-80.
- Eichholz, Georg, "Bewahren und Bewähren des Evangeliums: der Leitfaden von Philipper 1-2," *Hören und Handeln, Festschrift für Ernst Wolf zum 60. Geburtstag*, eds. Helmut Gollwitzer and Hellmut Traub, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1962, 85-105.

- Ellingworth, P., "Colossians i. 15-20 and its Context," *ET*, LXXIII (1962), 252-53.
- Feuillet, A., "L'hymne christologique de l'épître aux Philippiens (II, 6-11)," *RB*, LXXII (1965), 481-507.
- Findlay, G. G., "Paul the Apostle," *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. James Hastings, Vol. III (1902), 701-03.
- Furness, J. M., "The Authorship of Philippians ii. 6-11," *ET*, LXX (1959), 240-43.
- , "Behind the Philippian Hymn," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 178-82.
- Georgi, Dieter, "Der vorpaulinische Hymnus Phil. 2, 6-11," *Zeit und Geschichte*, ed. E. Dinkler, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1964.
- Glasson, T. Francis, "Colossians I 18, 15 and Sirach XXIV," *NT*, XI (1969), 154-56.
- Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr., "Pauline Chronology and Pauline Theology," *Christian History and Interpretation: Studies Presented to John Knox*, eds. W. R. Farmer, C. F. D. Moule, R. R. Niebuhr, Cambridge: University Press, 1967.
- Jewett, Robert, "The Epistolary Thanksgiving and the Integrity of Philippians," *NT*, XII (1970), 40-53.
- Käsemann, Ernst, "Kritische Analyse von Phil. 2: 5-11," *ZTK*, XLVII (1950), 313-60.
- , "Die Legitimität des Apostels. Eine Untersuchung zu II Kor. 10-13," *ZNW*, XLI (1942), 33-71.
- , "Eine urchristliche Tauf liturgie," *Festschrift Rudolf Bultmann zum 65. Geburtstag Überreicht*, ed. E. Wolf, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1949.
- Kuhn, K. G., "Der Epheserbrief im Lichte der Qumrantexte," *NTSt*, 7 (1961), 334-46.
- Lattey, C., "The Evidence for the Belief that our Lord Claimed To Be Divine," *ET*, LXII (1950-51), 31.
- Lietzmann, Hans, "Symbolstudien," *ZNW*, XXII (1923), 257-79.
- Ligier, Louis, "L'hymne christologique de Philippiens 2, 6-11, la liturgie eucharistique et la bénédiction synagogale «nishmat kol hay»,» *Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, volumen secundum, Rome, 1963.
- Louf, André, "Une ancienne exégèse de Phil. 2, 6 dans le KeTĀBĀ DeMAS-QĀTĀ (Livre des degrés)," *Analecta Biblica*, 17-18, volumen secundum, Rome, 1963.
- Mackay, B. S., "Further Thoughts on Philippians," *NTSt*, 7 (1961), 161-70.
- Manson, William, "The ΕΙΩ ΕΙΜΙ of the Messianic Presence in the New Testament," *JTS*, XLVIII (1947), 137-45.
- Martin, Ralph P., "An Early Christian Hymn (Col. 1: 15-20)," *EQ*, XXXVI (1964), 195-205.
- , "An Epistle in Search of a Life-Setting," *ET*, LXXIX (1968), 296-302.
- Metzger, Bruce M., "Considerations of Methodology in the Study of the Mystery Religions and Christianity," *Harvard Theological Review*, XLVIII (1955), 1-20.
- , "A Reconsideration of Certain Arguments Against the Pauline Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles," *ET*, LXX (1958), 91-94.
- Meyer, P. W., "The Problem of the Messianic Self-Consciousness of Jesus," *NT*, IV (1960), 122-38.
- Munck, J., "The New Testament and Gnosticism," *Current Issues in New Testament Interpretation*, eds. Klassen and Snyder, New York: Harper and Bros., 1962.

- Mussner, Franz, "Contributions Made by Qumran to the Understanding of the Epistle to the Ephesians," *Paul and Qumran*, ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, London: G. Chapman, 1968.
- Piper, Otto A., "The Origin of the Gospel Pattern," *JBL*, LXXVIII (1959), 115-24.
- Pollard, T. E., "The Integrity of Philippians," *NTSt*, 13 (1966), 57-66.
- Robinson, James M., "Formal Analysis of Col. 1: 15-20," *JBL*, LXXVI (1957), 270-87.
- Sanders, Ed Parrish, "Literary Dependence in Colossians," *JBL*, LXXXV (1966), 28-45.
- Sanders, J. A., "Dissenting Deities and Philippians 2: 1-11," *JBL*, LXXXVIII (1969), 279-90.
- Schmidt, K. L., "Der Apostel Paulus und die Antike Welt," *Wege der Forschung*, Vol. XXIV (*Das Paulusbild in der neueren deutschen Forschung*), ed. Karl Heinrich Rengstorff, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964.
- Schmithals, W., "Zur Abfassung und ersten Sammlung der paulinischen Hauptbriefe," *ZNW*, LI (1960), 225-45.
- Stempvoort, P. A. van, "De betekenis van Filippenzen 2: 5 t/m 11," *Nederlands theologisch Tijdschrift*, XIX (1964), 97-111.
- Strecker, Georg, "Redaktion und Tradition im Christushymnus," *ZNW*, 55 (1964), 63-78.
- Talbert, Charles H., "The Problem of Pre-existence in Philippians 2: 6-11," *JBL*, LXXXVI (1967), 141-53.
- Taylor, Vincent, "W. Wrede's *The Messianic Secret in the Gospels* (*Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*)," *ET*, LXV (1953-54), 246-50.

III. BIBLICAL AND PAULINE THEOLOGY

A. Theological Commentaries

- Baggott, L. J., *A New Approach to Colossians*, London: A. R. Mowbray and Co., Ltd. 1961.
- Barth, Karl, *The Epistle to the Philippians*, London: SCM Press Ltd., 1962.
- , *Romans*, London: Oxford University Press, 1933.
- , *A Shorter Commentary on Romans*, Richmond, Va.: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Barth, Markus, *The Broken Wall, a Study of the Epistle to the Ephesians*, Chicago: Judson Press, 1959.
- Calvin, John, *Commentaries on the Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- , *Commentary on the Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Philippians, Colossians, Thessalonians*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957.
- Gnilka, Joachim, *Der Philipperbrief* (HTKNT, X, 3), Freiburg: Herder, 1968.
- Héring, Jean, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, London: Epworth Press, 1962.
- Hill, C. L., tr., *The Loci Communes of Philip Melancthon*, Boston: Meador Publishing Co., 1944.
- Hodge, Charles, *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, rev. ed., Philadelphia: H. B. Garner, 1883.
- Hofmann, J. C. K. von, *Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments*, vols. II, III, XI, Nördlingen: C. H. Beck, 1868-86.
- Kehl, Nikolaus, *Der Christushymnus im Kolosserbrief: Eine motiugeschicht-*

- liche Untersuchung zu Kol 1, 12–20 (*Stuttgarter Biblische Monographien*, 1), Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.
- Knabenbauer, Iosepho S. J., *Commentarius in S. Pauli Apostoli Epistolas, IV: Epistolae ad Ephesios, ad Philippenses, et ad Colossenses (Cursus Scripturae Sacrae*, eds. R. Cornely, I. Knabenbauer, Fr. de Hummelauer), Paris: Sumptibus P. Lethielleux, 1912.
- Moule, H. C. G., *Colossian Studies, Lessons in Faith and Holiness from St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians and Philemon*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1903.
- Munck, Johannes, *St. Paul and the Salvation of the Jews*, Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.
- Nygren, Anders, *Commentary on Romans*, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1949.
- Pauck, Wilhelm, tr. and ed., *Luther: Lectures on Romans (The Library of Christian Classics*, Vol. XV), Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Peake, A. S., *The Revelation of John*, London: Holborn Press, n. d.
- Schlatter, Adolf von, *Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament*, 10 Bänden, Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1928–36.
- , *Gottes Gerechtigkeit*, zweite Auflage, Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1952.
- , *Paulus der Bote Jesu, eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther*, Stuttgart: Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1934.
- Schmidt, Hans Wilhelm, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer (Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*, Vol. VI), Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1962.

B. Biblical Theology

1. Books

- Barth, Karl, *Christ and Adam: Man and Humanity in Romans 5* (*Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers*, Vol. V), Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1956.
- Berkhof, Hendrik, *Christ and the Powers*, Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1962.
- Beyschlag, Willibald, *New Testament Theology*, Vol. I, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1895.
- Bonsirven, Joseph, *Theologie du Nouveau Testament*, Paris: Aubier, 1951.
- Bowman, John Wick, *The Intention of Jesus*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1943.
- , *Prophetic Realism and the Gospel*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955.
- Büchsel, Friedrich, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Geschichte des Wortes Gottes im Neuen Testament)*, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1935.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *Gnosis*, trans. J. R. Coates, Vol. V of *Bible Key Words*, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1952.
- , *Jesus and the Word*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- , *Jesus Christ and Mythology*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- , *Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols., London: SCM Press, 1952–55.
- , *Das Verhältnis der urchristlichen Christusbotschaft zum historischen Jesus*, zweite Auflage (*Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse*, 1960), Heidelberg: C. Winter Universitätsverlag, 1961.
- Burkitt, F. C., *Church and Gnosis: A Study of Christian Thought and Speculation in the Second Century*, Cambridge: The University Press, 1932.

- Burrows, Millar, *An Outline of Biblical Theology*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946.
- Caird, G. B., *Principalities and Powers*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Cairns, David, *A Gospel Without Myth?*, London: SCM Press, 1960.
- Conzelmann, Hans, *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament* (tr. by John Bowden), New York: Harper & Row, 1969.
- Craddock, Fred B., *The Pre-existence of Christ in the New Testament*, New York: Abingdon, 1968.
- Cullmann, Oscar, *Christ and Time, the Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1950.
- , *The Christology of the New Testament*, second edition, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1963.
- , *The State in the New Testament*, New York: Scribner, 1956.
- Daniélou, Jean, *The Theology of Jewish Christianity, The Development of Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*, Vol. I, London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1964.
- Dodd, Charles Harold, *According to the Scriptures, the Substructure of New Testament Theology*, London: Nisbet, 1952.
- , *The Apostolic Preaching and its Development*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944.
- Eichrodt, Walther, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Vols. II–III, vierte neu bearbeitete Auflage, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1961.
- , *Theology of the Old Testament*, Vol. I, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961.
- Feine, Paul, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1951.
- Frövig, A., *Der Kyriosglaube des Neuen Testaments und das Messiasbewusstsein Jesu* (Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, Band XXXI, Heft 2), Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1928.
- Fuller, Reginald H., *The Foundations of New Testament Christology*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
- , *The Mission and Achievement of Jesus* (SBT, 12), London: SCM Press, 1954.
- Gärtner, Bertil, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*, Uppsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1955.
- Gilkey, Langdon B., *Maker of Heaven and Earth*, Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1959.
- Gogarten, Friedrich, *Demythologizing and History*, London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Goppelt, Leonhard, *Jesus, Paul and Judaism: an Introduction to New Testament Theology*, New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1964.
- Grant, F. C., *An Introduction to New Testament Thought*, New York: Abingdon, 1950.
- Hanson, S., *The Unity of the Church in the New Testament: Colossians and Ephesians* (*Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis*, Vol. XIV), Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1946.
- Héring, Jean, *Le Royaume de Dieu et sa Venue*, nouvelle édition, Neuchâtel: Éditions Delachaux et Niestlé, 1959.
- Hofmann, J. C. K. von, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments* (Vol. XI of *Die heilige Schrift Neuen Testaments*, 13 vols), Nördlingen: Verlag der C. H. Beck'schen Buchhandlung, 1886.
- Holtzmann, Heinrich Julius, *Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie*, 2 vols., Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911.

- Jones, Geraint Vaughan, *Christology and Myth in the New Testament*, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd., 1956.
- Kähler, Martin, *Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus*, München: C. Kaiser, 1953; (English tr. by Carl E. Braaten; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964).
- Käsemann, Ernst, *New Testament Questions of Today*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969; (Tr. by W. J. Montagne from *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen*², II).
- Knight, George A. F., *A Christian Theology of the Old Testament*, Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1959.
- Kramer, Werner, *Christos, Kyrios, Gottessohn, Untersuchungen zu Gebrauch und Bedeutung der christologischen Bezeichnungen bei Paulus und den vorpaulinischen Gemeinden* (ATANT, XLIV), Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963. (Eng. tr. by Brian Hardy; SBT, L; London: SCM, 1966).
- Kümmel, W. G., *Promise and Fulfilment, the Eschatological Message of Jesus*, second edition (SBT, XXIII), London: SCM, 1961.
- Larsson, Edwin, *Christus als Vorbild* (Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis, Vol. XXIII), Upsala: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1962.
- Leivestad, Ragnar, *Christ the Conqueror, Ideas of Conflict and Victory in the New Testament*, London: S.P.C.K., 1954.
- Lemonnyer, A., *The Theology of the New Testament*, London: Sands & Co., 1929.
- Lindeskog, Gösta, *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Schöpfungsgedanken*, Vol. I (Vol. XI of *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* 1952), Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, 1952.
- Löwe, Richard, *Kosmos und Aion, ein Betrag zur heilsgeschichtlichen Dialektik des urchristlichen Weltverständnisses* (Neutestamentliche Forschungen, ed. Otto Schmitz, dritte Reihe, 5. Heft), Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1935.
- Mays, James Luther, *Exegesis as a Theological Discipline*, Richmond, Va.: Union Theological Seminary, 1960.
- Meinertz, Max, *Theologie des Neuen Testamentes*, 2 vols., Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1950.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm, *Versöhnung des Alls*, Gümligen, Bern: Verlag Siloah, 1950.
- Morrison, Clinton D., *The Powers That Be* (SBT, XXIX), London: SCM, 1960.
- Moule, C. F. D., *Man and Nature in the New Testament*, London: Athlone Press, 1964.
- Piper, Otto A., *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols., Manuscript privately circulated at Princeton Theological Seminary, 1951.
- , *Erlösung als Erfahrung*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1932.
- , *New Testament Interpretation of History*, privately circulated by the Theological Book Agency, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N.J., 1963.
- Rad, Gerhard von, *Old Testament Theology*, Vol. I, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.
- Rawlinson, A. E. J., *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1926.
- Richards, J. McDowell (ed.), *Soli Deo Gloria: New Testament Studies in Honor of William Childs Robinson*, Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1968.
- Richardson, Alan, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament*, New York: Harper and Bros., 1958.
- Robinson, James M., *The Problem of History in Mark* (Studies in Biblical Theology, Vol. XXI), London: SCM Press, 1957.

- Robinson, J. A. T., *The Body* (SBT, 5), London: SCM, 1952.
- , *Twelve New Testament Studies* (SBT, XXXIV), London: SCM Press, 1962.
- Rowley, H. H., *The Relevance of Apocalyptic*, London: Lutterworth, 1947.
- , *The Unity of the Bible*, New York: Meridian Books, 1957.
- Russell, D. S., *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Rust, E. C., *Nature and Man in Biblical Thought*, London: Lutterworth Press, 1953.
- Schlatter, Adolf, *Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2 vols., Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1909–1910.
- Schlier, Heinrich, *Principalities and Powers in the New Testament*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1961.
- Schmid, C. F., *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1877.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf, *New Testament Theology Today*, London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1963.
- Schneider, Gerhard, *Neuschöpfung oder Wiederkehr? Eine Untersuchung zum Geschichtsbild der Bibel*, Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1961.
- Schwantes, Heinz, *Schöpfung der Endzeit (Arbeiten zur Theologie, XII)*, Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.
- Schweizer, Eduard, *Erniedrigung und Erhöhung bei Jesus und seinen Nachfolgern*, zweite Auflage (ATANT, XXVIII), Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1962.
- , *Lordship and Discipleship* (SBT, XXVIII), London: SCM Press, 1960.
- , *Neotestamentica*, Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1963.
- Scott, E. F., *The Varieties of New Testament Religion*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943.
- Snaith, N. S., *Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament*, London: Epworth, 1944.
- Stauffer, Ethelbert, *New Testament Theology*, New York: Macmillan, 1959.
- Taylor, Louis H., *The New Creation*, New York: Pageant Press, 1958.
- Taylor, Vincent, *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*, second edition, London: Epworth Press, 1954.
- , *The Person of Christ in New Testament Teaching*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1958.
- Vos, Geerhardus, *Biblical Theology, Old and New Testaments*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.
- Weinel, Heinrich, *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments, die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums (Grundriss der Theologischen Wissenschaften, III. 2)*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1911.
- Weiss, Bernhard, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, 2 vols., Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1882.
- Wernle, Paul, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, ed. Rev. W. D. Morrison, Vol. I, New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1903.
- Wrede, W., *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1901.
- Wright, G. Ernest, *The Old Testament Against Its Environment* (SBT, II), London: SCM, 1950.

2. Articles

- Anderson, Bernhard W., "The Earth Is the Lord's," *Interp*, IX (1955), 3–20.
- Barr, James, "The Interpretation of Scripture, II: Revelation Through

- History in the Old Testament and in Modern Theology," *Interp*, XVII (1963), 193-205.
- , "The Word Became Flesh: the Incarnation in the New Testament," *Interp*, X (1956), 16-23.
- Bloom, Alfred, "Human Rights in Israel's Thought," *Interp*, VIII (1954), 422-32.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, "Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutischer Methode," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, LXXV (1950), 205-12.
- Cullmann, Oscar, "Out of Season Remarks on the 'Historical Jesus' of the Bultmann School," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, XVI (1960), 131-48.
- Dahl, N. A., "Christ, Creation, and Church," *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, eds. W. D. Davies and D. Daube, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956, pp. 422-43.
- Gibbs, John G., "Rudolf Bultmann and his Successors," *SJT*, XVIII (1965), 396-410.
- Gilkey, Langdon B., "Cosmology, Ontology, and the Travail of Biblical Language," *Journal of Religion*, XLI (1961), 194-205.
- Hayes, John H., "The Resurrection as Enthronement and the Earliest Church Christology," *Interp*, XXII (1968), 333-45.
- Heitmüller, Wilhelm, "Zum Problem Paulus und Jesus," *ZNW*, XIII (1912), 320-37.
- Jeremias, Joachim, "Zur Gedankenführung in den paulinischen Briefen," *Studia Paulina*, eds. J. N. Sevenster and W. C. van Unnik, Haarlem: de Erven F. Bohn N.V., 1953, pp. 146-54.
- Kelly, Balmer H., "Word of Promise: the Incarnation in the Old Testament," *Interp*, X (1956), 3-15.
- Koch, Gerhard, "Jesus Christus—Schöpfer der Welt," *ZTK*, LVI (1959), 83-109.
- Kraus, H.-J., "Schöpfung und Weltvollendung," *EvT*, XXIV (1964), 462-85.
- Kysar, Robert, "Rudolf Bultmann's Interpretation of the Concept of Creation in John 1, 3-4," *CBQ*, XXXII (1970), 77-85.
- Lindeskog, Gösta, "The Theology of Creation in the Old and New Testaments," *The Root of the Vine*, Anton Fridrichsen *et al.*, London: Dacre Press, 1953.
- Longenecker, Richard N., "Some Distinctive Early Christological Motifs," *NTSt*, 14 (1968), 526-45.
- Marshall, I. Howard, "Professor Ferdinand Hahn's 'Christologische Hoheitstitel,'" *ET*, LXXVIII (1967), 212-15.
- Martin, James Perry, "Cosmic Christ and Cosmic Redemption, An Essay in Interpretation," *Affirmation*, I (July, 1967), 4-31. (Published by Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va.)
- Menoud, Philippe H., "Revelation and Tradition," *Interp*, VII (1953), 131-41.
- Meye, Robert P. (tr.), "The Reply of Professor Cullmann to Roman Catholic Critics," *SJT*, 15 (1962), 36-43.
- Neil, William, "The Person of Christ in the New Testament," *ET*, LXXIV (1962), 40-42.
- Oesterley, W. O. E., and Charles, R. H., "Eschatology," *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, fourteenth edition (1958 printing), Vol. II, 101-05.
- Piper, Otto A., "Christology and History," *TTod*, XIX (1962), 324-40.
- , "Foreword," in J. C. K. von Hofmann, *Interpreting the Bible*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1959.

- , "The Transforming Power of the Gospel," *TTod*, XII (1956), 436–50.
- Rad, Gerhard von, "Das theologische Problem des alttestamentlichen Schöpfungsglaubens," *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments*, Volz, Stummen, and Hempel, editors, Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1936.
- Ramseyer, Jean-Philippe, "Signification de la création," *Verbum Caro*, VI (1952), 97–107.
- Reicke, Bo, "Incarnation and Exaltation: The Historic Jesus and the Kerygmatic Christ," *Interp*, XVI (1962), 156–68.
- Riesenfeld, H., "The Mythological Background of New Testament Christology," *The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1956, pp. 81–95.
- Robinson, James M., "Basic Shifts in German Theology," *Interp*, XVI (1962), 76–97.
- , "The New Hermeneutic at Work," *Interp*, XVIII (1964), 346–59.
- Rordorf, W., "The Theology of Rudolf Bultmann and Second-Century Gnosis," *NTSt*, 13 (1967), 351–62.
- Wallace, David H., "Biblical Theology: Past and Future," *TZ*, XIX (1963), 88–105.
- Wilder, Amos N., "Eschatological Imagery and Earthly Circumstance," *NTSt*, V (1958–59), 229–45.
- Zimmerli, Walther, "The Place and Limit of the Wisdom in the Framework of the Old Testament Theology," *SJT*, XVII (1964), 146–58.

C. Pauline Theology

1. Books

- Allo, E.-B., *Paul, apôtre de Jesus-Christ*, Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 1946.
- Amiot, François, *The Key Concepts of St. Paul*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1962.
- Barrett, C. K., *From First Adam To Last, a Study in Pauline Theology*, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1962.
- Baur, F. C., *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ, His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols., London: Williams and Norgate, 1873.
- Bonsirven, Joseph, *L'Évangile de Paul*, Paris: Aubier, 1948.
- Bornkamm, Günther, *Das Ende des Gesetzes (Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie, ed. W. Wolf, XVI)*, München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1952.
- Cerfaux, Lucien, *Christ in the Theology of St. Paul*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1959.
- Clemen, Carl, *Paulus: sein Leben und Wirken*, 2 vols., Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1904.
- Dibelius, Martin, *Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1909.
- Feuillet, André, *Le Christ Sagesse de Dieu d'après les épîtres pauliniennes (Études Bibliques)*, Paris: J. Gabalda, 1966.
- Gabathuler, Hans Jakob, *Jesus Christus, Haupt der Kirche—Haupt der Welt (ATANT, 45)*, Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1965.
- Goguel, Maurice, *L'Apôtre Paul et Jesus-Christ*, Paris: Libraire Fischbacher, 1904.
- Holsten, Carl, *Zum Evangelium des Paulus und des Petrus*, Rostock: Stiller'sche Hofbuchhandlung, 1868.
- Hunter, A. M., *Interpreting Paul's Gospel*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1954.
- , *Paul and his Predecessors*, revised edition, London: SCM Press, 1961.

- Käsemann, Ernst, *Leib und Leib Christi, eine Untersuchung zur paulinischen Begrifflichkeit* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie, Vol. IX), Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1933.
- Lengsfeld, Peter, *Adam und Christus (Die Adam-Christus-Typologie im Neuen Testament und ihre dogmatische Verwendung bei M. J. Scheeben und K. Barth)*, Essen: Ludgerus-Verlag Hubert Wingen AG, 1965.
- Moe, Olaf, *The Apostle Paul, His Message and Doctrine*, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1954.
- Munck, Johannes, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, Richmond, Va.: John Knox, 1959.
- Odeberg, Hugo, *The View of the Universe in the Epistle to the Ephesians* (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift N. F. Avd. 1. Bd 29. Nr. 6), Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1934.
- Pfleiderer, Otto, *Paulinism: A Contribution to the History of Primitive Christian Theology*, 2 vols., London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.
- Prat, Fernand, S. J., *The Theology of Saint Paul*, 2 vols., Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, n. d.
- Ridderbos, H., *Paul and Jesus*, Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1958.
- Schoeps, Hans Joachim, *Paul, the Theology of the Apostle in the Light of Jewish Religious History*, London: Lutterworth Press, 1961.
- Schweitzer, Albert, *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, New York: Henry Holt, 1931.
- , *Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus*, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1930.
- , *Paul and his Interpreters*, New York: Macmillan, 1951.
- Scott, C. A. A., *Christianity According to St. Paul*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press, 1927.
- Steiger, Robert, *Die Dialektik der Paulinischen Existenz (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, ed. Hans Windisch, Heft 20)*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1931.
- Stewart, James S., *A Man In Christ, The Vital Elements of St. Paul's Religion*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- Weinel, Heinrich, *St. Paul, the Man and His Work*, London: Williams and Norgate, 1906.
- Whiteley, D. H., *The Theology of St. Paul*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1964.
- Wikenhauser, Alfred, *Pauline Mysticism, Christ in the Mystical Teaching of St. Paul*, New York: Herder and Herder, 1960.
- Windisch, Hans, *Paulus und Christus*, Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1934.
- Wrede, Wilhelm, *Paul*, London: Philip Green, 1907.

2. Articles

- Bakken, Norman K., "The New Humanity: Christ and the Modern Age," *Interp*, XXII (1968), 71-82.
- Barth, Markus, "Conversion and Conversation: Israel and the Church in Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians," *Interp*, XVII (1963), 3-24.
- Black, Matthew, "Pauline Doctrine of the Second Adam," *SJT*, VII (1954), 171-72.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, "Adam und Christus nach Rm 5," *ZNW*, L (1959), 145-65.
- , "ΔΙΚΑΙΟΕΥΝΗ ΘΕΟΥ," *JBL*, LXXXIII (1964), 12-16.
- Conzelmann, Hans, "Current Problems in Pauline Research," *Interp*, XXII (1968), 171-86.
- , "Paulus und die Weisheit," *NTSt*, 12 (1966), 231-44.

- Feuillet, A., "La création de l'univers 'dans le Christ' d'après l'épître aux Colossiens (I.16a)," *NTSt*, 12 (1966), 1-9.
- Gerber, Uwe, "Röm. VIII 18ff. als exegetisches Problem der Dogmatik," *NT*, VIII (1966), 58-81.
- Gibbs, John G., "The Relation Between Creation and Redemption According to Phil. II 5-11," *NT*, XII (1970), 270-83.
- Harvey, John, "A New Look at the Christ Hymn in Philippians 2 : 6-11," *ET*, LXXVI (1965), 337-39.
- Jeremias, Joachim, "The Key to Pauline Theology," *ET*, LXXVI (1964), 27-30.
- Lee, Jung Young, "Interpreting the Demonic Powers in Pauline Thought," *NT*, XII (1970), 54-69.
- Lohse, Eduard, "Pauline Theology in the Letter to the Colossians," *NTSt*, 15 (1969), 211-20.
- Macgregor, G. H. C., "Principalities and Powers: the Cosmic Background of Paul's Thought," *NTSt*, I (1954), 17-28.
- Munck, Johannes, "Pauline Research Since Schweitzer," in J. Philip Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible in Modern Scholarship : Papers Read at the 100th Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature, December 28-30, 1964* (New York: Abingdon, 1965).
- Piper, Otto, "Christ and Adam. Man and Humanity in Romans 5, by Karl Barth," *JBL*, LXXVII (1958), 180-81.
- , "The Saviour's Eternal Work: an Exegesis of Col. 1 : 9-29," *Interp*, III (1949), 286-98.
- Zwaan, D. de, "Paulinische Weltanschauung," *Zeitschrift für die Systematische Theologie*, VIII (1931), 539-78.

IV. THEOLOGICAL, PHILOSOPHICAL AND OTHER STUDIES

A. Books

- Balthasar, Hans Urs von, *Karl Barth, Darstellung und Deutung seiner Theologie*, Köln and Olten: Jakob Hegner Bucherei, 1951.
- Barth, Karl, *Church Dogmatics*, II.1, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1957.
- , *Church Dogmatics*, III.1, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1958.
- , *Church Dogmatics*, III.2, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1960.
- , *Church Dogmatics*, IV.1, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1956.
- , *Die Kirchliche Dogmatik*, III/1, zweite Auflage, Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1947.
- , *Die protestantische Theologie im 19. Jahrhundert*, zweite Auflage, Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1952.
- Bartsch, Hans Werner, editor, *Kerygma and Myth*, revised edition by Reginald H. Fuller, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1961.
- , editor, *Kerygma and Myth*, Vol. II, London: S.P.C.K., 1962.
- Beck, Lewis White, *A Commentary on Kant's Critique of Practical Reason*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Berkouwer, G. C., *The Triumph of Grace in the Theology of Karl Barth*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956.
- Brown, James, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology*, London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Bruce, Alexander Balmain, *The Humiliation of Christ in its Physical, Ethical, and Official Aspects*, second ed., New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son, 1892.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption* (Dog-

- matics* : Vol. II), tr. Olive Wyon, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1952.
- , *Das Missverständnis der Kirche*, Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1951.
- , *Revelation and Reason*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1946.
- Bultmann, Rudolf, *Essays, Philosophical and Theological*, trans. J. C. G. Greig, London: SCM Press, 1955.
- , *History and Eschatology*, Edinburgh: The University Press, 1957.
- Calvin, John, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, eds. J. T. McNeill and F. L. Battles, Vol. I, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960.
- Cohn, L. and Wendland, P., eds., *Philonis Alexandrini, Opera quae supersunt*, Vol. I, Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1962.
- Collingwood, R. G., *The Idea of History*, New York: Oxford Univ. Press Galaxy Book, 1957.
- Dawe, Donald G., *The Form of a Servant*, Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.
- Diem, Hermann, *Dogmatics*, I, Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd, 1959.
- Dubos, René, *So Human an Animal*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons Lyceum Edition, 1968.
- Elert, Werner, *Der Ausgang der Altkirchlichen Christologie*, Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1957.
- Farrar, F. W., *Eternal Hope, Five Sermons Preached in Westminster Abbey November and December, 1877*, London: Macmillan and Co. Ltd., 1904.
- Frost, Stanley Brice, *Standing and Understanding: A Re-appraisal of the Christian Faith*, Montreal: McGill University Press, 1969.
- Galloway, A. D., *The Cosmic Christ*, London: Nisbet & Co., 1951.
- Gilkey, Langdon, *Naming the Whirlwind: The Renewal of God-Language*, New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.
- Gottschalk, Louis, *Understanding History: A Primer of Historical Method*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1958.
- Heim, Karl, *Christian Faith and Natural Science*, New York: Harper and Brothers Torchbooks, 1957.
- Heinemann, F. H., *Existentialism and the Modern Predicament*, New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1958.
- Kant, Immanuel, *Kritik of Judgment*, tr. and ed. J. H. Bernard, London: Macmillan and Co., 1892.
- Kelly, J. N. D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1958.
- Kierkegaard, S., *Concluding Unscientific Postscript*, tr. D. F. Swenson, ed. Walter Lowrie, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1944.
- Löwith, Karl, *Meaning in History*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- Lowrie, Walter, *Kierkegaard*, London: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- , *A Short Life of Kierkegaard*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942.
- Lütgert, Wilhelm, *Schöpfung und Offenbarung (Beiträge zur Förderung Christlicher Theologie, Band XXXIV)*, Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1934.
- Macquarrie, John, *The Scope of Demythologizing*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Mays, James Luther, *Exegesis as a Theological Discipline*, Richmond, Va.: Union Theological Seminary, 1960.
- Neve, J. L., *A History of Christian Thought*, Vol. I, Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1946.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard, *Christ and Culture*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951.

- Niebuhr, Richard R., *Resurrection and Historical Reason*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1957.
- Ogden, Schubert M., editor, *Existence and Faith: Shorter Writings of Rudolf Bultmann*, New York: Meridian Books, 1960.
- Ott, Heinrich, *Die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus und die Ontologie der Geschichte* (*Theologische Studien*, Heft 62), Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1960.
- Prenter, Regin, *Schöpfung und Erlösung*, 2 vols., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1958-60.
- Steck, K. G., *Die Idee der Heilsgeschichte* (*Theologische Studien*, eds. Karl Barth and Max Geiger, Heft LVI), Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1959.
- Temple, William, *Nature, Man, and God*, London: Macmillan and Co., 1951.
- Thielicke, Helmut, *Weltanschauung und Glaube*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1946.
- Torrance, Thomas F., *The School of Faith*, London: James Clarke, 1959.
- Watson, Philip S., *Let God Be God!, an Interpretation of the Theology of Martin Luther*, London: Epworth Press, 1947.
- Weizsäcker, C. F. von, *The History of Nature*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press Phoenix Books, 1966.

B. Articles

- Berger, Peter, "Some Sociological Comments on Theological Education," *Perspective: A Journal of Pittsburgh Theological Seminary*, 2 (1968), 127-38.
- Buess, Eduard, "Zur theologiegeschichtlichen Stellung der Schöpfungslehre Karl Barths," *TZ*, II (1946), 183-90.
- Callahan, Daniel, "Cosmic Purpose and Self-Identity," *TTod*, XXV (1968), 169-84.
- Dantine, W., "Creation and Redemption: Attempt at a Theological Interpretation in the Light of the Contemporary Understanding of the World," *SJT*, XVIII (1965), 129-47.
- Dawe, Donald G., "A Fresh Look at the Kenotic Christologies," *SJT*, XV (1962), 337-49.
- Ellul, Jacques, "Mirror of These Ten Years," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVII (1970), 200-04.
- Fairweather, E. R., "Appended Note: The 'Kenotic' Christology," *The Epistle to the Philippians*, by F. W. Beare, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959.
- Fuchs, Ernst, "Bultmann, Rudolf," *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. I, dritte Auflage, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1957, cols. 1511-12.
- Gibbs, J. G., "A Secondary Point of Reference in Barth's Anthropology," *SJT*, XVI (1963), 132-35.
- , "Interpretations of the Relation Between Creation and Redemption," *SJT*, XXI (1968), 1-12.
- Kreck, Walter, "Analogia fidei oder analogia entis?," *Antwort: Festschrift zu Karl Barth, 70. Geburtstag*, Zollikon: Evangelischer Verlag, 1956.
- Lampe, G. W. H., "The New Testament Doctrine of *Ktisis*," *SJT*, XVII (1964), 449-62.
- Lyonnet, S., "Redemptio 'cosmica' secundum Rom. 8, 19-23," *Verbum Domini*, 44 (1966), 225-42.
- Means, Richard L., "Ecology and the Contemporary Religious Conscience," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVI (1969), 1546-49.

- , "Man and Nature: The Theological Vacuum," *The Christian Century*, LXXXV (1968), 579-81.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, "Creation and Causality in the History of Christian Thought," *Pastoral Psychology*, X (1959-60), 11-20.
- Prenter, Regin, "Die Einheit von Schöpfung und Erlösung," *TZ*, II (1946), 161-82.
- Santmire, H. Paul, "The Struggle for an Ecological Theology: A Case in Point," *The Christian Century*, LXXXVII (1970), 275-77.
- Schlink, Edmund, "The Ecumenical Contribution of the Russian Orthodox Church," *SJT*, XII (1959), 41-67.
- Schweizer, Eduard, "Zur Interpretation des Römerbriefes," *EvT*, XXII (1962), 105-107.
- Whitehouse, W. A., "Christ and Creation," *Essays in Christology for Karl Barth*, ed. by T. H. L. Parker, London: Lutterworth Press, 1956, pp. 115-32.

V. REFERENCE WORKS

- Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Metzger, Bruce M.; and Wikgren, Allen (eds.), *The Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart, West Germany: United Bible Societies, 1966.
- Arndt, W. F., and Gingrich, F. W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature (A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*, fourth revised and augmented edition, 1952), Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Brown, F., Driver, S. R., Briggs, C. A., editors, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius), Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1952.
- Cross, F. L., editor, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, corrected reprint of 1958 edition, London: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Dana, H. E. and Mantey, J. R., *A Manual Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, sixteenth printing of 1927 ed., New York: Macmillan Co., 1950.
- Funk, Robert W., translator and reviser of F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, ninth-tenth German edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Galling, Kurt et al. (eds.), *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, dritte Auflage, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957-62.
- Hatch, Edwin, and Redpath, Henry A., *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*, Vol. I, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1897.
- Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version*, New York, Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1952.
- Kittel, Gerhard and Friedrich, Gerhard (eds.), *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933ff.
- Kittel, Rudolf et al., editors, *Biblia Hebraica*, seventh ed., Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1951.
- Lightfoot, J. B., *The Apostolic Fathers*, Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1962.

- Metzger, Bruce M., *Index to Periodical Literature on the Apostle Paul* (NTTS, I), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1960.
- , *Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels* (NTTS, VI), Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1966.
- Migne, J. P., editor, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus; Series Graeca*, Vol. VII, Petit-Montrouge: J.-P. Migne, 1857.
- Morgenthauer, Robert, *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*, Zürich: Gotthelf Verlag, 1958.
- Moulton, J. H. and Milligan, G., *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1949.
- Moulton, William F., and Geden, Alfred S., editors, *A Concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English revisers*, second edition, New York: Scribner, 1900.
- Nestle, Eberhard and Nestle, Erwin, editors, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 20. Auflage, Stuttgart: Privileg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1950.
- Rahlf's, Alfred (ed.), *Septuaginta id est vetus testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, editio quarta, 2 vols., Stuttgart: Privilegierte Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1950.
- Roberts, A., and Donaldson, J., editors, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers, Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325*, Vol. I, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899.
- Robertson, A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, third edition, New York: George H. Doran, 1919.
- Robertson, A. T. and Davis, W. Hersey, *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament*, New York: Harper and Brothers, 1933.
- Smith, J. B., *Greek-English Concordance to the New Testament*, Scottdale, Pa.: Herald Press, 1955.
- Strack, Hermann L. and Billerbeck, Paul, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Vol. III, München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1926.
- Thayer, J. H., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, New York: American Book Co., 1889.
- Trench, R. C., *Synonyms of the New Testament*, ninth edition, Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans, 1953.

INDEX LOCORUM

I. OLD TESTAMENT

<i>Genesis</i>		<i>Job</i>		34 : 4	45
1-3	53, 55, 8of., 89	4 : 16	80	34 : 9	45
1 : 1	106f.	38-41	41	35 : 1-6	41
1 : 26	102			45 : 5-7	41
1 : 27	106	<i>Psalms</i>		45 : 20-25	75
1 : 31	140	2 : 4	131	45 : 23	88f., 141
2 : 7	106	8 : 6	141	52 : 13-53 : 12	87, 103
2 : 15	156	11 : 4	131	53 : 3	141
2 : 17	141	17 : 15	80	53 : 7	84
3 : 5	141	24 : 1	108	53 : 8	87
3 : 14-19	55, 141	38 : 6	42	53 : 11f.	141
3 : 17	40, 42, 43, 147	50 : 12	108	54 : 5	41
6	55	81 : 1	63	55 : 2-13	44
12 : 3	133	96 : 5	63	65 : 17	44
21 : 12	133	96 : 11	108		
22 : 16	38	97 : 7	63	<i>Jeremiah</i>	
49 : 3	106	98 : 7	108	8 : 16	108
		106 : 37	63	8 : 19	43
<i>Exodus</i>		110 : 1	128f., 141	12 : 4	55, 147
20 : 2-3	64	138 : 1	63	12 : 11	55, 147
		148 : 4	131	29 : 2	108
<i>Numbers</i>		<i>Proverbs</i>		<i>Ezekiel</i>	
12 : 8	80	3 : 19f.	41, 72	12 : 19	108
<i>Deuteronomy</i>		8 : 12	70	19 : 7	108
4 : 35	64	8 : 15-16	61	30 : 12	108
6 : 4	64, 89, 141	8 : 22f.	41, 72, 102, 107, 112	32 : 15	108
10 : 14	131			34 : 25-27a	41
21 : 17	106	8 : 25-27	141	38 : 19b-23	41, 45
21 : 23	78	8 : 30	67		
32 : 17	63	14 : 31	41	<i>Hosea</i>	
<i>I Kings</i>		20 : 12	41	2 : 18	41
8 : 27	131	21 : 11	70	5 : 11	43
16 : 2	43	<i>Ecclesiastes</i>		<i>Joel</i>	
16 : 13	43	1 : 2-3	141	3 : 15	45
<i>I Chronicles</i>		<i>Isaiah</i>		<i>Zechariah</i>	
16 : 32	108	2 : 20	43	12 : 10-13 : 7	103, 141
		11 : 6-9	41	14 : 12-17	45
<i>Nehemiah</i>		24 : 5	45, 55		
9 : 6	131	30 : 15	43	<i>Malachi</i>	
		33 : 9	45, 55	2 : 10	141

2. APOCRYPHA AND PSEUDEPIGRAPHIA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

<i>II Esdras</i> (= IV Ezra)		<i>Baruch</i>		61 : 10	63
3 : 7	55	4 : 7	63	65	41, 45
3 : 21-22	49			83-90	41, 45
3 : 26	55	<i>Maccabees</i>	71	101	41, 45
4 : 30	49, 55				
6 : 55	41, 45	<i>IV Maccabees</i>		<i>II Enoch</i>	
7 : 11	41, 45, 55	17 : 5	129	(= <i>Slavonic Enoch</i>)	
7 : 75	44			20 : 1	63
7 : 92	55	<i>Jubilees</i>		30 : 8-10	55
7 : 116-26	55	3 : 28	55	30 : 13	55
7 : 118	49				
13 : 26	44	<i>Apocalypse of Moses</i>		<i>Sibylline Oracles III</i>	
<i>Wisdom of Solomon</i>	69	(= <i>Life of Adam and Eve</i>)			41, 45
2-4	87	8 : 2	55	III, 24-26	55
2 : 24	51	24	55		
5 : 5	85	28	55	<i>Assumption of Moses</i>	
7 : 22ff. 67, 72, 102, 111		32	51	1 : 12	41, 45
8 : 10-13	61	<i>I Enoch</i>		10	41, 45
8 : 15	72	(= <i>Ethiopic Enoch</i>)			
<i>Sirach</i>		1 : 6-7	41, 45	<i>II Baruch</i>	
1 : 1ff.	102	2-5 : 3	45, 55	17 : 3	55
24 : 3ff.	72	7 : 5-6	41, 45, 55	19 : 8	55
24 : 8f	102, 112	41 : 8	41, 45	54 : 15	55
25 : 24	55	45 : 46-5a	41	54 : 19	55
40 : 1-11	55	54 : 7-10	41, 45	56 : 6	55

3. QUMRAN LITERATURE

<i>Manual of Discipline</i> (IQS)		<i>Hymns of Thanksgiving</i> (IQH)		<i>Commentary on</i> <i>Habakkuk</i> (IQpHab)	
4 : 18f.	124	1 : 21	124	7 : 13	124
11 : 5f.	124				

4. NEW TESTAMENT

<i>Matthew</i>		12 : 29	64	14 : 9	87
5 : 13	126	12 : 32	64	15 : 27	106
7 : 2	126	13 : 19	45, 55	17 : 2	115
9 : 16	108	14 : 24f.	56	17 : 5	80
19 : 4	106	<i>Luke</i>	12	20 : 17	115
19 : 8	106	2 : 14	100	<i>Acts</i>	10
28 : 1	89	8 : 31	38	2 : 36	76, 78, 91
<i>Mark</i>	10	16 : 2-4	121	3 : 15	106
1 : 11	85, 96	<i>John</i>		3 : 21	76
1 : 15	142			7	135
2 : 21f.	56, 107	1 : 3f.	31	8 : 39	83
4 : 11	124	2 : 23	129	9	149
6 : 43	108	12 : 42	160	13 : 33	76

14 : 12	62	5 : 14	140, 145	13 : 13	36
16 : 12	78	5 : 18	149	14 : 9	69, 75, 150
17 : 26	64	5 : 19	69	14 : 11	89
17 : 30f.	151	6	94	14 : 14	144, 156
19 : 26ff.	62, 64	6 : 5	133	15 : 6f.	79
22 : 3-21	150	6 : 6	147	15 : 9-12	41
22 : 7	149	6 : 12	36	16 : 25f.	125
22 : 28	119	6 : 22f.	144		
26 : 4-23	150	7	46, 149	<i>I Corinthians</i>	68, 71
26 : 4	106	7 : 7ff.	36, 148	1-2	78
26 : 9	149	7 : 13-25	39	1 : 5	64
26 : 14	149	7 : 14	127	1 : 6	115
26 : 23	104, 106	7 : 21-23	43, 145	1 : 18-31	66
		7 : 23	35, 146f.	1 : 20f.	51
<i>Romans</i>		7 : 24f.	39	1 : 23	78, 91
1-8	3	8	34-39, 154	2	66
1-5	48, 52, 151	8 : 3	146	2 : 2	69
1 : 1-7	3	8 : 12-39	149	2 : 4	65
1 : 2	141	88 : 17	133	2 : 6-16	70, 125
1 : 3	85, 96	8 : 18-39	3, 34-47, 55, 57f., 91f., 153	2 : 6-8	75, 148
1 : 4	36, 50, 76, 85, 108, 142, 150	8 : 18-25	62, 142f.	2 : 6f.	65, 122, 125
1 : 8	34, 51	8 : 19-23	33, 77, 104, 135, 142-45, 156	2 : 8	46, 59
1 : 11	127	8 : 20f.	140f., 142, 145, 147f.	2 : 13	65f., 127
1 : 17	26	8 : 22	74, 145, 147	2 : 14f.	126f.
1 : 18-5 : 21	48	8 : 28-30	65, 83	3 : 1-4	71, 127
1 : 18-3 : 20	38, 145	8 : 29	51, 104	3 : 18f.	51
1 : 23	108	8 : 31ff.	114, 145	4 : 4f.	54
1 : 28	115	8 : 34	67, 131	4 : 9	27
2 : 16	54	8 : 38f.	46, 62, 69, 75, 106, 134f., 145	4 : 10	64
2 : 20	71	10 : 4	144	5 : 5	145
3 : 6	54	10 : 6-9	61, 82	5 : 7	115
3 : 16	51	10 : 9	60, 69	6 : 3	27, 43
3 : 19	51	10 : 12	64	6 : 20	128, 144
3 : 21	38	11 : 12	51	7 : 1	64
3 : 22	26	11 : 15	51	7 : 25	64
3 : 26	26	11 : 25	125	8 : 1-5	62-67
3 : 30	64	11 : 29-36	60	8 : 6	3, 27, 38, 43, 59-73, 77, 82, 89, 91f., 104, 113, 134-36, 141, 143, 148, 150, 152
4 : 3ff.	26	11 : 32	76	8 : 7-13	65
4 : 17	2	11 : 33ff.	67	8 : 11f.	66
4 : 24	26	11 : 33	70	9 : 23-10 : 22	65
4 : 25	52	11 : 36	3, 41, 59, 64, 68	10 : 4	61, 71
5-8	43, 145	12-15	144	8	
5 : 1-11	48, 49, 56, 152	12 : 1	128, 144	10 : 20	62f.
5 : 1	26	12 : 2	56	10 : 26	108
5 : 3-5	39	12 : 3-11	147	10 : 28	108
5 : 6	122, 145	12 : 6	145	11 : 3	147
5 : 9-11	48, 145	13 : 1-7	62	11 : 7	80
5 : 12-21	3, 48-58, 77, 83, 91f., 122, 135f., 140f., 143-45, 147, 152	13 : 10	107	11 : 12	64
				11 : 17-20	147

11 : 26 150
 11 : 29 147
 12 145, 147
 12 : 1 64, 127
 12 : 3 36, 60, 69
 13 114
 13 : 12 65
 14 66
 14 : 2 125
 14 : 20 65
 14 : 26 66
 14 : 33 66
 14 : 40 66
 15 23, 31, 56
 15 : 1-5 69
 15 : 3-5 47, 71, 135, 141
 15 : 3 69, 149
 15 : 14-28 27
 15 : 20-28 14
 15 : 20 104
 15 : 21ff. 3, 48, 53, 55, 135
 15 : 24ff. 75, 111
 15 : 24 38, 46, 106, 134, 144, 146
 15 : 25f. 38, 69
 15 : 27f. 76
 15 : 42 43
 15 : 44 127
 15 : 45ff. 3, 48, 53f., 127, 135f.
 15 : 45 36, 54, 106
 15 : 49 51, 83
 16 : 1 64
 16 : 12 64

II Corinthians

1 : 5f. 133
 3 : 17f. 36
 3 : 18 51, 83, 145
 4 : 4-6 80, 103
 4 : 14 150
 5 : 15 79
 5 : 10 54
 5 : 14-21 100
 5 : 17 44, 143
 5 : 19 89, 99f.
 6 : 3-10 47
 8 : 9 82, 135
 11 : 14 147
 11 : 23-33 47
 12 : 1-4 83, 131

Galatians

1 : 4 115
 1 : 11-16 149
 2 : 19 146
 2 : 20 133
 3 : 13 78
 3 : 19 111
 3 : 22ff. 122, 146
 4 : 2 122, 146
 4 : 3 38, 46, 51, 69, 105, 146
 4 : 4 122, 142
 4 : 8-10 64, 69, 146f.
 4 : 8 38, 63f., 70
 4 : 9 38, 46, 65, 105
 4 : 13 69
 5 : 11 78
 5 : 16f. 36
 5 : 24 36
 6 : 11ff. 78
 6 : 14f. 4, 150
 6 : 15 44, 143

Ephesians 31, 93f., 112

1 : 1 115, 125
 1 : 3-14 3, 77, 114-34, 137, 140f., 143f., 153
 1 : 4 84, 109
 1 : 10 76, 110, 134, 140, 142f., 156
 1 : 15 117
 1 : 16 116
 1 : 17 115, 117, 140
 1 : 18 115, 140
 1 : 19 99
 1 : 20-22 3, 74, 128, 140, 142
 1 : 21 38, 46, 106
 1 : 22 115, 134, 141
 1 : 23 134
 2 : 2 43, 129f., 145f.
 2 : 6 128, 131
 2 : 19 122
 3 : 4 125f.
 3 : 6 125
 3 : 8-10 137
 3 : 9 121, 125f.
 3 : 10 46, 62, 128-30, 148
 3 : 19 125
 4 : 4 60
 4 : 5f. 3, 59, 67
 4 : 5 62

4 : 6 64, 68
 4 : 9f. 130
 4 : 10 108, 131, 145
 4 : 11-16 145
 4 : 13 125
 4 : 17 42
 4 : 24 54
 4 : 32 115
 5 : 19 127
 5 : 21ff. 144
 5 : 32 125
 6 : 10-20 145, 147
 6 : 12 43, 46, 106, 127-31, 146
 6 : 19 125

Philippians

1 : 7 115
 1 : 11 79
 2 : 1-11 77, 145
 2 : 4 77, 153
 2 : 5-11 3, 14, 33, 54, 71, 73-93, 96, 135-37, 141, 144
 2 : 6-8 71, 95, 141, 145
 2 : 9-11 62, 111, 142f., 149
 2 : 10 41, 129
 2 : 11 60
 2 : 12f. 77, 100, 153
 2 : 15 145
 3 : 3-11 4, 145
 3 : 8 150
 3 : 10 133
 3 : 20 128f.
 3 : 21 83

Colossians 31, 112f.

1 : 2 109
 1 : 3-2 : 7 101, 153
 1 : 3 109
 1 : 10-14 101, 103, 153
 1 : 10 109
 1 : 11 109
 1 : 13 43, 46, 96, 100, 109, 141, 145-48
 1 : 15-20 3, 14, 37, 60, 62, 64, 67, 69, 77, 82, 93-114, 135, 137, 141f., 143, 149, 153

1 : 15	80, 140f., 145	3 : 16	127	2 : 10	67f.
1 : 16f.	67, 134, 141, 147f.	3 : 17-24	109	4 : 14	131
1 : 16	3, 41, 46, 59, 106, 146, 148	4 : 7	109	6 : 4-6	56
1 : 17	156	4 : 17	109	8 : 1	119
1 : 19	145, 155	<i>I-II Thessalonians</i>	23, 69	8 : 8-13	56
1 : 20	41, 76, 89, 137, 142f.	<i>I Thessalonians</i>		10 : 21	122
1 : 21-2 : 3	96	1 : 2-10	50, 115	<i>James</i>	
1 : 21-23	100, 145	1 : 9	64, 70	1 : 12	100
1 : 24	105, 145	2 : 18	43, 145	3 : 9	126
1 : 26f.	125	3 : 11-13	115	4 : 6	100
1 : 27	109, 125	4 : 13f.	31	<i>I Peter</i>	
2 : 3	71, 107	4 : 17	83	4 : 17	122
2 : 6	109	4 : 18	126	<i>II Peter</i>	
2 : 8-10	3	5 : 3-10	145	2 : 18	42
2 : 8	38, 46, 51, 62, 105, 145	<i>II Thessalonians</i>		3 : 4	106
2 : 9	99f., 108	2 : 1-12	147	<i>I John</i>	
2 : 10-15	46, 96	<i>I Timothy</i>		2 : 24	106
2 : 10	38, 105f.	3 : 5	122	<i>Revelation</i>	
2 : 14f.	46	3 : 16	47, 95, 114	1 : 5	106
2 : 15	69, 74f., 106, 145, 148	4 : 4	140, 144	3 : 14	106
2 : 16	109, 111	6 : 20	71	5 : 1-14	76
2 : 19	134	<i>II Timothy</i>	1 : 10 122	5 : 13	41, 74f.
2 : 20	38, 46, 51, 105, 145f.	<i>Titus</i>	1 : 3 142	9 : 1	38
2 : 23	111	<i>Hebrews</i>		9 : 20	63
2 : 25-29	125	1 : 2ff.	82	11 : 8	127
3 : 2	100	1 : 3	95	12 : 5	83
3 : 5ff.	96, 145	1 : 10	106	19 : 5	41
3 : 9f.	54			21 : 1	44
3 : 10	56, 80				

5. EXTRA-CANONICAL EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

<i>I Clement</i>		Polycarp		IV, 38, 1	120
54 : 3	108	<i>Philippians</i> 2	74	V, 29, 2	120
<i>II Clement</i>		<i>Martyrdom of Polycarp</i>		Tertullian	
14 : 1-3	127	2 : 2	121	<i>Adversus Marcion</i>	
Ignatius				V, 17	119
<i>Ephesians</i>		Irenaeus		<i>De monog.</i>	
13 : 2	74	<i>Adversus Haereses</i>		5	119
18 : 2	121	I, 9, 2	120	Origen	
20 : 1	121	III, 18, 1	119		
<i>Trallians</i>		III, 21, 10	120		
9	74	III, 22, 1	120		

<i>Commentary on John</i>		<i>Haereses</i>		<i>Apocalypse of Paul</i>	
5 : 6	120	II, 73, 7	106	3-6	42, 45
<i>De principiis</i>		Chrysostom	119, 128	<i>Apocalypse of Thomas</i>	
I, 6, 3	120	Jerome	128		45
II, 8, 4-8	120	Theodoret	74	<i>Odes of Solomon</i>	
III, 6, 6	120			6 : 5	124
Epiphanius		<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>	45	7 : 28	124
				8 : 9-11	124

6. CLASSICAL, HELLENISTIC, LATIN AND OTHER WRITINGS

<i>Apocryphon of John</i>	53	<i>De opificio mundi</i>		<i>Respublica</i>	
Aristotle		4	106	II, 12	107f.
<i>Fragments</i>		17	67		
123	119	20	67	<i>Timaeus</i>	
<i>Asclepius</i>		<i>Legum allegoriae</i>		26	119
(= Λόγος Τέλειος in CH)		I, 41	60	30 C	106
I, 2	106	I, 43	102	92 C	102
<i>Corpus Hermeticum</i>		II, 49f.	72	Polybius	
11 : 15	102	II, 86	71	Ἰστοριῶν, II, 47, 10	120
12 : 15	102	III, 96	102	Quintillian	
<i>Paris Magical Papyrus</i>		<i>Quod deus immutabilis sit</i>	102	<i>Institutio oratoria</i>	
74f., 129		Plato		VI, 1	119
Philo	71, 112f.	<i>Leges</i> 643 D	119	Theocritus 25 : 5	75

INDEX AUCTORUM

- Abbott, T. K. 99, 103, 119, 121f., 161
 Allmen, D. von 100, 164
 Allo, E. B. 23, 60ff., 64, 161, 177
 Althaus, P. 41, 48, 161
 Altizer, T. 81
 Amiot, F. 19f., 177
 Anderson, B. W. 153, 175
 Angus, S. 131, 166
 Arndt, W. F. 40, 42, 74f., 108, 115, 119-21, 124f., 127, 129, 182
 Bakken, N. K. 73, 81, 178
 Bammel, E. 98, 169
 Bandstra, A. J. 46, 51, 61, 161
 Barr, J. 7, 88, 175
 Barrett, C. K. 45, 57, 65, 161, 166, 169, 177
 Barth, K. 43f., 49-53, 56, 85f., 140, 171f., 179
 Barth, M. 94, 104, 113, 122, 164, 171, 178
 Baudissin, W. 33
 Bauernfeind, O. 42, 164
 Baur, F. C. 2, 4, 6-9, 26f., 177
 Beare, F. W. 82, 85f., 117, 121, 123, 161
 Behm, J. 80, 164
 Bengel, J. A. 7, 48, 128, 161
 Berger, P. 155, 181
 Berkhof, H. 146, 172
 Bevan, E. 123
 Beyschlag, W. 8-9, 13, 16, 18, 172
 Beza, T. 128
 Billerbeck, P. 40, 71
 Black, M. 85, 166, 169, 178
 Blass, F. 99, 126, 132
 Bloom, A. 140, 176
 Bolton, R. H. 159
 Bonhoeffer, D. 81
 Bonsirven, J. 24f., 172, 177
 Bornkamm, G. 84, 110f., 124f., 164, 169, 177
 Borsch, F. H. 54, 120, 166
 Bousset, W. 12, 33, 70, 123, 166
 Bouttier, M. 132
 Brandenburger, E. 49, 56, 161
 Brockington, L. H. 80, 164
 Brown, R. M. 159
 Brunner, E. 40, 65, 143, 179
 Buck, C. 5
 Büchsel, F. 25, 132, 172
 Bultmann, R. 4, 28-31, 33, 36, 42, 46, 50f., 53, 56, 60, 68, 70, 75, 96, 100, 110, 128, 166, 169, 172, 176, 178, 180
 Burney, C. F. 106, 165
 Burrows, M. 13f., 173
 Burton, E. D. 4, 161
 Buttrick, G. A. 121
 Cairns, D. 29, 173
 Callahan, D. 34, 154, 181
 Calvin, J. 40, 110, 144, 171, 180
 Cambier, J. 49, 53, 161, 165
 Carrez, M. 37, 165
 Carson, R. 156
 Cerfaux, L. 23f., 33, 63, 110, 125, 165, 177
 Chadwick, H. 114
 Clemen, C. 12, 123, 166, 177
 Coffin, W. S. Jr. 158
 Collingwood, R. G. 7, 180
 Colpe, C. 53, 167
 Commoner, B. 156
 Conzelmann, H. 29-31, 34, 53, 64, 69, 70, 72, 93, 102f., 113, 133, 135, 161, 173, 178
 Coppens, J. 124f.
 Cox, H. 81
 Craddock, F. B. 33, 72, 79, 81f., 104, 111, 135, 169, 173
 Cullmann, O. 32f., 40, 47, 54, 60f., 74f., 77, 81, 85, 89, 123, 167, 173, 176
 Dahl, N. A. 56, 114, 144, 176
 Daniélou, J. 91, 106, 124, 173
 Danker, F. W. 48f., 165
 Dantine, W. 1, 143, 181
 Daube, D. 56, 144
 Davey, N. 91
 Davies, W. D. 26, 35f., 46, 49, 54, 56, 70, 87, 91, 110, 117, 120, 123-25, 128, 133, 144, 167
 Davis, W. H. 129, 151, 183

- Dawe, D. G. 85ff., 180, 181
 Debrunner, A. 99, 126, 132
 Deichgräber, R. 41, 73, 77, 79, 91f.,
 97f., 102f., 105, 114, 167
 Deissmann, A. 11, 33, 74, 129, 132f.,
 161, 167
 Dellling, G. 106, 165
 Denney, J. 36
 Dibelius, M. 47, 90, 94, 110, 120,
 125, 146, 162, 167, 177
 Diem, H. 30, 180
 Dinkler, E. 69, 73
 Dobschütz, E. von 150, 165
 Dodd, C. H. 5, 49, 85, 162, 167, 173
 Donaldson, J. 119, 183
 Dubos, R. 156, 180
 Dupont, J. 64f., 70f., 124, 167

 Eadie, J. 121, 128f., 162
 Ebeling, G. 30
 Ehrlich, P. 156
 Eichholz, G. 78, 169
 Elert, W. 47, 180
 Ellingworth, P. 98, 170
 Ellul, J. 160, 181
 Eltester, F. W. 102

 Fairweather, E. R. 85, 181
 Farrar, F. W. 120, 180
 Feine, P. 11, 21, 28, 173
 Feuillet, A. 56, 69, 73, 91, 102ff.,
 112, 135, 170, 177, 179
 Foerster, W. 33, 63, 144, 162, 165,
 167
 Fridrichsen, A. 54
 Friedrich, G. 129
 Frost, S. B. 154, 180
 Fry, J. R. 158
 Fuller, R. H. 29, 33, 60, 82, 135,
 167, 173
 Funk, R. W. 99, 182
 Furness, J. M. 73, 83, 90, 170
 Furnish, V. P. 5

 Gabathuler, H. J. 94, 97f., 100, 105,
 177
 Gabler, J. P. 8
 Gärtner, B. 151, 167, 173
 Galloway, A. D. 111, 146, 180
 Geden, A. S. 150
 Georgi, D. 73, 170
 Gerber, U. 34, 40, 42, 44, 179
 Gerritzen, F. D. 132f., 165

 Gettleman, M. E. 159
 Gewiess, J. 111
 Gibbs, J. G. 30, 52, 73, 139, 176,
 179, 181
 Gilkey, L. 156ff., 173, 176, 180
 Gingrich, F. W. 40, 42, 74f., 108,
 115, 119ff., 124f., 127, 129
 Glasson, T. F. 112, 170
 Gnilka, J. 73, 90, 171
 Godet, F. L. 37, 63ff., 162
 Goguel, M. 15, 18
 Gollwitzer, H. 78
 Goodenough, E. R. 123
 Goppelt, L. 3, 173
 Gottschalk, L. 7, 180
 Grant, F. C. 13f., 167, 173
 Grant, R. M. 3, 5, 60, 68, 167
 Griffith, G. O. 41, 165
 Güemes, H. 37, 165

 Hahn, F. 33, 60, 135, 168
 Hall, C. A. M. 154
 Hamilton, W. 81
 Hammerlich, L. L. 83
 Hanh, T. N. 159
 Hanson, S. 119f., 173
 Harnack, A. von 12
 Harrisville, R. A. 56, 143, 165
 Harvey, J. 73, 80f., 179
 Hatch, E. 12, 129, 182
 Hayes, J. H. 60, 176
 Headlam, A. C. 34, 41f., 44, 50, 56,
 69
 Hegermann, H. 61, 69, 71, 98, 102,
 104-107, 111-113, 135, 168
 Héring, J. 62f., 65, 171, 173
 Hodge, C. 40, 49, 171
 Hofmann, J. C. K. von 21, 48, 171,
 173
 Holsten, C. 8, 26f., 177
 Holtzmann, H. J. 8f., 27, 48, 110f.,
 173
 Hort, F. J. A. 101
 Hoskyns, E. 91, 168
 Hugedé, N. 93, 97, 102, 162
 Hunter, A. M. 19f., 33, 43, 85, 95,
 97, 145, 162, 177
 Hurd, J. C. 5, 59, 62, 168, 170
 Hyatt, J. P. 6, 179

 Jeremias, J. 53, 84, 149, 165, 168,
 176, 179
 Jervell, J. 55, 80, 91, 96, 162

- Jewett, R. 73, 170
 Jüngel, E. 56
- Käsemann, E. 30, 67f., 70, 74, 78,
 90, 95f., 98, 101, 105, 109, 117, 170,
 174, 177
 Kahin, G. M. 159
 Kant, I. 130, 180
 Kehl, N. 93f., 97ff., 102-108, 112f.,
 171
 Kelly, J. N. D. 120, 180
 Kennedy, H. A. A. 74, 123, 162
 King, M. L. Jr. 158
 Kittel, G. 129, 165, 182
 Kirby, J. C. 114, 124, 135, 168
 Klassen, W. 50, 56
 Kleinknecht, H. 102, 165
 Knox, W. L. 43, 68, 91, 106, 111,
 125, 168
 Koch, G. 1, 102, 176
 Köster, H. 68
 Kramer, W. 33, 75, 77, 132, 151f.,
 174
 Kraus, H. J. 40, 176
 Kuhn, K. G. 124, 170
 Kuist, H. 101
 Kümmel, W. G. 3-6, 8, 56, 69, 71,
 93, 168, 174
 Kysar, R. 31, 176
- Lacouture, J. 159
 Lampe, W. H. 40, 181
 Leahy, D. J. 119, 121, 162
 Leenhardt, F. J. 40, 42, 46, 162
 Leivestad, R. 43, 45, 75, 145f., 174
 Lemonnyer, A. 15, 174
 Lengsfeld, P. 50, 70, 178
 Lewis, J. W. 159
 Lietzmann, H. 41, 59, 67, 162, 170
 Lightfoot, J. B. 73, 80, 99f., 107,
 110, 119, 129f., 162, 182
 Lindeskog, G. 54, 174, 176
 Lipsius, R. A. 48, 162
 Lohmeyer, E. 76, 79, 91, 97f., 102,
 110, 162, 168
 Lohse, E. 93f., 97f., 100, 102-106,
 112, 163, 179
 Longenecker, R. N. 73, 90, 112,
 135, 176
 Louf, A. 91, 170
 Löwith, K. 7, 180
 Lüdemann, H. 8
 Luther, M. 128
- Lyonnet, S. J. 44, 181
- McCarthy, E. J. 158
 Macgregor, G. H. C. 45f., 179
 Martin, J. P. 1, 44, 104, 176
 Martin, R. P. 73f., 76, 78ff., 82f.,
 90f., 94f., 97, 114, 135, 150, 163,
 165, 168
 Masson, C. 95, 98, 102f., 110, 163
 Means, R. L. 156, 181
 Medebielle, R. P. 114, 163
 Meinertz, M. 15f., 18, 174
 Melanchthon, P. 3
 Metzger, B. M. 123, 170, 183
 Meyer, H. A. W. 37f., 40, 48, 163
 Michaelis, W. 104, 165, 174
 Michel, O. 121, 163, 165
 Migne, J. P. 119, 183
 Milligan, G. 119f., 125, 129, 150,
 183
 Moe, O. 13, 17f., 178
 Morgenthaler, R. 115, 150, 183
 Morrison, C. D. 61, 173
 Moule, C. F. D. 45, 84, 93, 97, 100,
 107, 111, 163, 172, 144
 Moulton, J. H. 119f., 125, 129, 150
 183
 Münsterlein, G. 99, 165
 Munck, J. 6, 26, 170, 178, 179
 Murphy-O'Connor, J. 124f.
 Mussner, F. 124, 171
- Nestle, E. 101, 183
 Neufeld, V. H. 33, 59f., 62, 66, 75,
 77, 88, 150f., 168
 Neugebauer, F. 133, 165
 Neve, J. L. 120, 180
 Nicoll, W. R. 74, 115, 118
 Niebuhr, R. R. 7, 181
 Nietzsche, F. 157
 Nineham, D. E. 80
 Nock, A. D. 91, 123, 168
 Norden, E. 60, 67, 95, 97, 99, 114,
 168
 Nygren, A. 48f., 147, 172
- Odeberg, H. 130, 178
 Origen 120
- Parker, T. D. 157
 Peake, A. S. 99, 163, 172
 Pelikan, J. 25, 182

- Percy, E. 94, 110f., 121, 125, 131, 163
 Perrin, N. 60
 Pfeleiderer, O. 8f., 11, 13, 15, 18, 178
 Piper, O. 1, 21, 56, 66, 101, 104, 106ff., 141, 146, 171, 174, 176, 179
 Pirot, L. 43, 65, 114
 Plummer, A. 61, 63f., 163
 Pollard, T. E. 73, 171
 Pope, R. M. 129f., 166
 Prat, F. 20, 178

 Ramseyer, J.-P. 44, 177
 Rawlinson, A. E. J. 33, 123, 174
 Redpath, H. A. 129
 Reicke, B. 52, 77f., 104, 166, 177
 Reitzenstein, R. 53, 67f., 70, 123, 168
 Rengstorf, K. H. 12, 84
 Richards, J. M. 30, 52, 100, 155, 174
 Richardson, A. 14, 174
 Ritschl, A. 8
 Roberts, A. 119, 183
 Robertson, A. 61, 63f., 163
 Robertson, A. T. 126, 129, 183
 Robinson, D. W. B. 73, 84, 166
 Robinson, J. M. 30f., 51, 60, 82, 98, 100, 112f., 155, 171, 174, 177
 Robinson, J. A. T. 85, 107, 117, 120ff., 175
 Rokeach, M. 159
 Rordorf, W. 30, 177
 Rubenstein, R. 157

 Salmond, S. D. F. 115, 118ff., 126, 129, 131, 163
 Sanday, W. 34, 41f., 44, 50, 56, 69, 163
 Sanders, J. A. 73, 77, 81f., 92, 171
 Santmire, H. P. 155, 182
 Sasse, H. 41, 51, 166
 Scheeben, M. J. 50
 Scheer, R. 159
 Schlatter, A. 17f., 21, 40, 61, 75, 143, 172, 175
 Schlier, H. 45, 105, 114ff., 118f., 121-24, 127, 130, 163, 166, 168, 175
 Schmauch, W. 5, 76, 163
 Schmid, C. F. 27, 175
 Schmidt, H. W. 36f., 40f., 43, 172
 Schmidt, K. L. 12, 171
 Schmithals, W. 68f., 168, 171
 Schnackenburg, R. 7, 9, 11, 175

 Schneider, G. 41, 56, 175
 Schoeps, H. J. 4, 71, 178
 Schurmann, F. 159
 Schwantes, H. 58, 70, 175
 Schweitzer, A. 6, 8ff., 17, 22f., 123, 133, 178
 Schweizer, E. 3, 34, 38, 47, 54f., 61, 63, 69, 71, 78, 82, 87, 91, 98, 105, 107, 111f., 114, 127, 148, 164, 175, 182
 Scott, C. A. A. 19f., 123, 178
 Scott, E. F. 13f., 164, 175
 Scott, N. A. Jr. 157
 Scroggs, R. 42, 48, 51, 54ff., 80f., 93, 164
 Selwyn, E. G. 127f., 164
 Sittler, J. 1
 Snyder, G. F. 50, 56
 Soden, Hans von 121, 164
 Sohm, R. 66
 Spicq, R. P. C. 65, 164
 Stanley, D. 69
 Stauffer, E. 21f., 75, 175
 Stempvoort, P. A. van 78, 171
 Strack, H. L. 40, 71, 183
 Strecker, G. 73, 80ff., 171

 Talbert, C. H. 73, 81f., 171
 Taylor, V. 38, 87, 150, 164, 171, 175
 Thiessen, A. 42, 164
 Thomas, A. 131
 Thomas, W. L. Jr. 156
 Tillich, P. 158
 Tödt, H. E. 33, 82, 85, 164
 Traub, H. 78, 129f.
 Trudinger, P. 73, 166

 Unnik, W. C. van 36, 53, 78, 169

 Vahanian, G. 81
 Van Buren, P. M. 81
 Viard, A. 39f., 43, 164, 166
 Vincent, M. 86, 164

 Wallace, D. H. 73f., 80, 166, 177
 Weber, H. E. 21
 Weinell, H. 9-12, 67, 175, 178
 Weiss, B. 8f., 13, 16ff., 26, 37, 48, 164, 175
 Weis, J. 8, 60, 67, 108, 110, 164, 169
 Wernle, P. 9f., 175
 Westcott, B. F. 101
 Wette, W. M. L. 48, 164

Whiteley, D. E. H. 62, 178
Wilder, A. N. 41, 44, 177
Windisch, H. 12, 178

Wrede, W. 9f., 27, 175, 178
Wright, G. E. 70, 175